PART THREE

ITALIAN GAMES AND ITALIAN CARDS

CHAPTER 16

Tarocchino or Tarocchi Bolognesi

In the city of Bologna and its environs several different games are played with a quite distinctive form of Tarot pack, comprising only 62 cards and predictably called the Tarocco Bolognese. The name formerly used for this shortened pack, and applied also to the family of games played with it, was *Tarocchino*, which is of course just the diminutive of *Tarocco*; this term is, however, no longer current, and in Bologna the games are generically referred to simply as *tarocchi*. This Bolognese type of game is in several respects the most remarkable of all the many forms of Tarot. It is extremely complicated, but its complexity is of the sort that confers an extraordinary subtlety upon the play; it is certainly among the very best and most fascinating of all the games played with the Tarot pack. It can be shown to have remained very nearly unchanged since the beginning of the eighteenth century; in all probability, it has remained much the same since its invention. Although even in Bologna it is probably known only to a minority of card players, it is still played there with enthusiasm by people of all ages and social classes. What makes it remarkable above all else is the fact that, throughout its long history, of about 450 years, it has never been played anywhere else save in Bologna and its immediate neighbourhood. It is difficult to explain this fact, but it is so without a doubt; it has at no time become known in other parts of Italy, let alone elsewhere. This of course makes it, to its devotees, not only a game more captivating than any other, but a symbol of local patriotism.

The Tarocco Bolognese pack is an Italian-suited one from which the 2 to 5 have been omitted from each of the plain suits; it thus comprises forty suit cards, twenty-one trumps and the Matto. The date of origin of this shortened pack, and of the game played with it, is very difficult to determine. The earliest pack that can for certain be identified as a Tarocco Bolognese pack is the copper-engraved pack specially designed for the Bentivoglio family by Gioseppe Maria Mitelli in 1664;[1] the earliest one using the standard pattern is one in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris from the end of the seventeenth century.[2] This pattern was then already very old. It can be very clearly recognised from the two sheets, in the Rothschild Collection at the Louvre and in the École des Beaux Arts, which, in Chapter 4, were listed as no. (23) of the various fragments of fifteenth-century packs there discussed. These two sheets show only trumps, but, with the one exception of the Devil, which is entirely different in design from those of the later packs, comparison with the single-ended Bibliothèque Nationale pack (or even with a modern double-headed one) reveals a constancy of design, down to the smallest details, persisting through the centuries.[3]

---

[1] Mitelli's pack is completely non-standard; the numeral cards of Batons and, more particularly, of Swords have a certain general resemblance to those of the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian Tarot pack, and, in the Swords suit only, to the Leber *tarocchi* (see p. 392). A reproduction of the version of the engravings that was issued in book form was published in 1970 by Huber and Herpel, of Offenbach am Main, under the title *Bologneser Tarockspiel des 17. Jahrhunderts*. For illustrations, see C.P. Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1966, opp. pp. 99 and 232, and S.R. Kaplan, *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, p. 54. The date 1664 is due to Hargrave, op. cit., p. 245.

[2] In the volume Kh-34.

It seems certain, then, that the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets, which may be of the early sixteenth rather than the late fifteenth century, but cannot be any later than that, come from Bologna. Unfortunately, we have no ground for saying that they come from a Tarocchino, that is, from a shortened pack. Apart from an isolated card by Agnolo Hebreo, which shows the Devil and has the same general design as the Devil on the Rothschild sheet, no two popular Tarot packs that have survived to us from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries display the same design. Nevertheless, it is a universal law for playing cards in all countries and at all times that the designs quickly crystallise into standard patterns to which all makers of cards of a given type in a particular area conform. It is not to be supposed that Italian Tarot cards of the later fifteenth and of the sixteenth century formed any exception to this law: the diversity of designs in the few packs that have partially survived must reflect a divergence between the different standard patterns in vogue in different localities. All that we can say, therefore, is that the distinctive Bolognese designs, which came to be characteristic of the shortened Bolognese pack, had, at least for a great many of the trumps other than the Devil, already assumed their definitive form at the time the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets were made. We cannot say that the step of shortening the pack by omitting the 2 to 5 from every suit had yet been taken.

There is no ground for believing that the inventors of the game of Tarocchino had any intention of devising a special pack with which to play it. They invented a game played with a Tarot pack from which sixteen cards had been omitted, just as many games were played with shortened regular packs; but they imported no new feature into the pack. In the Tarocco Bolognese pack of today four of the trumps do indeed differ in subject from those of other Tarot packs: but this was not an original feature, and is due to adventitious circumstances. Again, to judge from the Bibliothèque Nationale pack and from a single-ended one made after 1725 in the British Museum,[4] there must, around the period 1690-1730, have been a custom of replacing the Jacks of the Cups and Coins suit by Maids. They subsequently disappeared, however; and since they do not figure in Mitelli's pack of 1664, and accounts of the game published in 1753 and 1754 refer only to *Fanti* (Jacks) and not to *Fantine* or the like, the period when the pack had this feature must have been relatively brief; in any case, it is not wholly without precedent (the Minchiate pack has Maids in these two suits), and little importance should be attached to it. Thus, apart from the omission of the sixteen suit cards, the pack differed originally from other Tarot packs only in the design, the standard pattern, employed. A particular standard pattern may sometimes come to be associated with a particular game, even exclusively with that game, as has the pattern used for the Spanish-suited pack with which the largely Breton game of Aluette is still played; but no-one devises a special pattern to go with a new game, if the pack to be used for it is to contain only familiar cards. The Bolognese pattern very probably existed for 78-card packs before the idea of shortening the pack had occurred to anybody. Indeed, as regards the suit cards, the pattern of the Tarocco Bolognese is shared with that of the Bolognese 40-card regular pack used for the game of Primiera, still extant and almost certainly going back to the sixteenth century. The Primiera Bolognese pattern may have been adapted from the Tarocco Bolognese; but it may also simply represent the pattern formerly used in Bologna for regular packs and Tarot packs alike.

Documentary evidence is very sparse. The inscription on the seventeenth-century portrait of Prince Castracani Fibbia, mentioned in Chapter 4, credits the game with having been invented before 1420; but, as we saw, no weight can be attached to this testimony: all that it proves is that by the seventeenth century Tarocchino was already very much an object of civic pride. Other early references show only that the Tarot pack was known, and manufactured, in Bologna continuously from the mid-fifteenth century. Among the goods stolen in a robbery there on 8 August 1459 was a pack of triumph cards (*unum par cartarum a triumphis*);[5] and in 1477 a certain Pietro Bonozzi is recorded as making both playing cards and triumphs (*le carte e triumphi da*

---

[3] See Chapter 20 for further discussion.

[4] 1-37 in O'Donoghue's catalogue of the Lady Schreiber Collection.

[5] Emilio Orioli, 'Sulle carte da giuoco a Bologna nel secolo XV', *Il Libro e la Stampa*, anno II (n. s.), 1908, pp. 109-19; see p. 112.

zugare).[6] In 1588 one Achille Pinamonti obtained from the Pope the income from a tax on playing cards, 5 *soldi* for a Primiera pack, 10 *soldi* for a pack of *tarocchi*;[7] and in 1668 there was written an unpublished *tarocchi appropriati* poem in which various ladies of Bologna were identified with the Tarocco trumps, and another one about the same time relating to the canons of S. Pietro.[8] None of these references tells us anything of the number of cards in a pack or of the game played with it. The earliest account of the game known to me is that in *Il Giuoco Pratico*, a card-game book by R. Bisteghi, first published anonymously in Bologna in 1753; in 1754 a very full description by Carlo Pisarri was published anonymously there under the title *Istruzioni necessarie per che si volesse imparare il dilettevole giuoco dei Tarocchini*. Pisarri tells us that he has read a 'very old' manuscript describing the mode of play in former times, which he explains together with the contemporary game. Though this is of great value in tracing the history of the game, it tells us nothing useful about its antiquity. Unfortunately there are, so far as I know, no certain sixteenth-century references to the game; since, presumably, it was, then as afterwards, confined to Bologna, this is not surprising. The earliest possible reference to it is by Francesco Berni in his *Capitolo del gioco della Primiera* published at Rome in 1526. In the prose commentary accompanying that poem, he scoffs at the game of Tarocco, and, at one point, employs the expression '*Sminchiate*'.[9] That term is otherwise known only in connection with the game of Tarocchino, in which it was used, up to the nineteenth century, as an instruction to one's partner to play his highest trump. It is therefore possible that Berni was alluding to Tarocchino. He was, however, a Florentine; he visited Bologna, but not, so far as I am aware, until 1529. There is thus no obvious reason why he should refer to a Bolognese game; moreover, he jests about the enormous number of cards a player has in his hand at *tarocchi*, whereas in Tarocchino a player has only fifteen cards at the start of play. It is, thus, quite likely that 'Sminchiate' was a term formerly in general use in Tarot games, of which we do not hear save in Tarocchino principally because the other games did not survive into the eighteenth century.

Despite our lack of any decisive proof, the belief in the great antiquity of Tarocchino to which the portait of Prince Fibbia attests makes it likely that it was invented before the seventeenth century. We should probably place its origin in the first half of the sixteenth century, perhaps early enough for Berni to have been alluding to it. The reason lies partly in its generic resemblance to Minchiate, which we know to have been in existence by 1543, and partly to the way in which the pack was shortened. We have seen that at Chambéry in the nineteenth century a game, otherwise unrelated to Tarocchino, was played with a pack shortened in exactly the same way, by the omission of the 2 to 5 from every suit; this practice may well have gone back to the eighteenth century. If so, it could be explained as a mechanical imitation of the method of shortening the French-suited regular pack for such games as Piquet, when this game was still played with 36 cards. In Piquet, the Ace is high, and the cards omitted are therefore the four lowest of each suit. In most forms of Tarot, the Aces have no especial significance, and there is no reason why a 62-card pack should not be formed by omitting the Ace to 4 from each suit (almost exactly this occurred in Sicily). The natural explanation of the method adopted for shortening the pack in Chambéry Tarot is that it was simply taken over from that used to obtain the 36-card regular pack.

---

[6] Ibid., p. 113 and pp. 117-19, where an entire notarised agreement is reproduced, distinguishing, throughout, between *carte* and *triumphi*.

[7] See Lodovico Frati, *La Vita Privata di Bologna dal secolo XIII al secolo XVII*, Bologna, 1890, p. 133.

[8] I.e. to the canons of the Cathedral. See L. Frati, op. cit., p. 184.

[9] The relevant words from Berni's light-hearted diatribe are: 'Un altro ... ha trovato che Tarocchi sono un bel gioco, & pargli essere in regno suo quando ha in mano un numero di dugento carte che a pena le puo tenere, et per non essere appostato le mescola cosi il meglio che puo sotto la tavola, viso proprio di Tarocco colui a chi piace questio gioco, che altro non vuol dir Tarocco che ignocco, sciocco, Balocco degno di star fra fornari & calzolari & plebei a giocarsi in tutto di un Carlino in quarto a tarocchi, o a trionfi, o a Sminchiate che si sia'. ('Another ... has found that *Tarocchi* is a fine game, and thinks himself in his kingdom when he has in his hand some two hundred cards which he can hardly hold, and so as not to be spied on shuffles them as best he can under the table; one who likes this game is a real *Tarocco*-face – for *Tarocco* means nothing else but a trifle, a stupid man, a toy – worthy to live among bakers and cobblers and common people to play for as much as a Carlino at *tarocchi*, or at *trionfi*, or at *Sminchiate* or whatever'.) '*Viso di* ...' ('face of ...') is an idiomatic expression introducing an insulting epithet, as in '*viso di ladro*' (literally, 'face of a thief'); Berni is pretending that the word *tarocco* has the same meaning as the other words with the *-occo* ending. A Carlino is a coin, which had various, often quite high, monetary values; presumably *un Carlino in quarto* specifies the particular type of such coin intended, equivalent to a *quarto d'ore*: Berni is indicating the extravagant losses that could occur in play. The verbs *sminchiare* and *minchiare* were used by speakers from southern Italy and Sicily with a sexual connotation, which is now accorded to them by all Italian speakers; by the seventeenth century, this meaning was known in Genoa, where there would have been many Neapolitans; but people living in Florence, Bologna and even Rome probably did not become aware of it until the nineteenth or perhaps the twentieth century.

It is natural to suspect the same to be true of the Tarocco Bolognese pack. Especially is this so in view of the fact that in Tarocchino the original ranking of the suit cards is preserved, so that, in Swords and Batons, the cards rank, in descending order, K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, A, while in Cups and Coins they rank K, Q, C, J, A, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. The omission of the 2 to 5 contrasts sharply with the method of shortening the pack to 54 cards we have seen to have been used in Piedmont, namely by omitting those six cards which are actually lowest in each suit, the Ace to 6 in Swords and Batons and the 5 to 10 in Cups and Coins; the Bolognese method is not readily intelligible save as an imitation of an already known means of shortening the regular pack. It has to be admitted that, on two counts, the case is not as strong as for the Chambéry game. For one thing, although a game using a 36-card regular pack, namely Trappola, was well known in Italy during the sixteenth century, this omitted, not the 2 to 5, but the 3 to 6, from each suit. There was a special reason for this, in that the 2s, the lowest cards of their suits, had a special role in the game. A sixteenth-century writer, Sperone Speroni, after describing the Trappola pack and the 40-card Primiera pack, says vaguely that there were other ways of shortening the regular pack for other games.[10] It is therefore possible that a pack missing the 2 to 5 was known; but, if so, it was much less famous than the Trappola pack (which Marcolino used for his fortune-telling book[11]). Furthermore, the Aces do play a particular role in Tarocchino, alone among Tarot games.

It seems most likely, nevertheless, that Tarocchino was invented at a time when the custom of shortening the regular pack had already come into fashion, that is, not until the sixteenth century. It seems likely, too, from the fact that in Tarocchino there are the same four cards omitted from each suit, that this occurred when the most usual shortened regular pack was a 36-card one, as in France and Germany, before the 40-card Spanish form came to predominate in Italy, as it does to this day. This would place the invention of the game no later than the sixteenth century. If, as seems plausible, we regard the game as likely to have been a little older than Minchiate, it probably came into existence in the first quarter of that century. This, in the absence of more definite clues, is the best guess that we can make.

The trumps of the Tarocco Bolognese differ in their order and numbering from those of the Tarot de Marseille, and, therefore, of the Tarocco Piemontese; but, as we saw, the latter order is probably, in detail, a French invention, and the order in the Tarocco Bolognese represents a distinct tradition, one of several known in different parts of Italy. There was, indeed, a peculiarity in the order as observed in play. As can be seen from Mitelli's Tarocchino pack and from that in the Bibliothèque Nationale, before 1725 the Pope, Emperor, Popess and Empress were present in the trump sequence, which had just the same subjects, though differently arranged, as the Tarot de Marseille.[12] As usual, these four cards ranked above the Bagatto and below all other trumps. But, unlike the practice in all other Tarot games, they had no order of precedence amongst themselves, but ranked as equal, being referred to collectively as *Papi* (Popes). If two or more *Papi* were played to a trick, the one played last beat the others.[13]

---

[10] Sperone Speroni, 'Trattatello de Gioco', in *Opere*, vol. V, Venice, 1740, pp. 441-2. Speroni lived from 1500 to 1588. He first mentions the Italian and the French suit-systems. He then says that sometimes you play with additional cards called *tarocchi*, sometimes without them. When you play without them, you sometimes use the full pack, sometimes a shortened one. Having mentioned Trappola and Primiera, for the latter of which you discard the 2s, 3s and 4s, he says that in several other games, played in various places, you discard other cards. In some games, he continues, you deal out the whole pack, in others each player receives only two, three or more cards. There are some games with two players, some with many. In some games you draw new cards as play proceeds, in others you use only the original hand dealt. In some games the player who makes most wins, in others the one who makes least. In some games the court cards are the highest of each suit; in others there are cards that beat them.

[11] See Chapter 5.

[12] Mitelli actually has two Popes and two Emperors.

The divergence in the subjects of the trump cards in the modern Tarocco Bolognese from those in other Tarot packs arose out of an imbroglio that occurred in 1725. In that year there was produced by Canon Luigi Montieri of Bologna a geographical Tarocchino pack. Geographical, heraldic and other instructional packs, in which the faces of the cards carried information together with an indication of their rank and suit as ordinary cards, were popular in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Montieri's cards had a small panel at the top, depicting a card of the Tarocco Bolognese pack, save that each suit had the Ace and 2 to 6 instead of the Ace and 6 to 10, a fact noted on the Ace of Cups. The body of each trump card retailed geographical information; the suit cards showed the coats of arms of the aldermen (*anziani*) and standard-bearers (*gonfalieri*) of Bologna from 1670 onwards. The publication of the pack caused annoyance to the Papal authorities, who had Montieri and all others concerned with its production arrested and the pack publicly burned. Bologna was then in the Papal States, but, under an agreement of 1447, enjoyed considerable autonomy. What annoyed the Roman authorities was that, in the list of forms of government given on the Matto, Bologna was cited as having a 'mixed' government. It was, however, quickly perceived that to proceed against Montieri and the others in this matter would cause deep resentment in a city proud of its ancient liberties; so the case was hurriedly dropped, and Montieri and the rest released after a few days' imprisonment. The Papal Legate contented himself with demanding that the *Papi* be replaced by four *Mori* (Moors) and the *Angelo* (Angel), which of course represented the Last Judgment, by a *Dama* (Lady). The first change, but not the second, was made, and the pack reissued, with full ecclesiastical sanction, with Moors replacing the *Papi* in the upper panels of those cards. Presumably, with the affront to Papal dignity thus allayed, there was felt to be no need to press the objection to the depiction of a sacred subject on the *Angelo*.[14]

The replacement of the *Papi* by the Moors was effected, not merely in Montieri's geographical pack, but, henceforth, in all Tarocco Bolognese packs, the new cards depicting Moorish kings being occasionally referred to as 'Satraps'. It may at first seem puzzling that the Papal authorities should have been so touchy about the presence of the Papal figures on trump cards in the Tarocco Bolognese, when this was a feature of the Tarot pack from its first invention. But what went without remark in Renaissance times was not so readily tolerated in the stern era of the Counter-Reformation and afterwards. We have seen that the figures of the Pope and Popess were constantly liable to give offence, offence so great as to deprive the unfortunate cardmaker of Prague of his head.[15] In all the German-speaking parts of Europe the two Papal figures were replaced, during the seventeenth century, by Jupiter and Juno, and, in Normandy and Belgium, by Bacchus and the Spanish Captain. In the Minchiate pack, which in the eighteenth century was well known in Rome, the five lowest trumps were known collectively as *Papi*, though they ranked in sequence: but this nomenclature, which was not used in the sixteenth century, was not reflected in the trump subjects, which included neither Pope nor Popess. There is, in the Leber Collection at Rouen, a non-standard sixteenth-century Tarot pack, probably from Venice, which still includes the Pope; but a fragmentary one made in the early seventeenth century in Rome by a cardmaker using the trade-name 'alla Colonna' evidently no longer included him. The trumps in the alla Colonna pack must have been numbered from 1 to 21; trump 5 is a Sultan and trump 6 is Love. Love is always superior to the Papal and Imperial cards in every pack, and it is unthinkable that a Sultan should be superior to the Pope (especially in a pack made in Rome): so it is clear that the Pope and Popess had been replaced, in the alla Colonna pack, by other figures. Unfortunately, the absence of the nine lowest trumps from all surviving examples of a type of pack made in seventeenth-century Florence by a cardmaker using the trade-name 'Orfeo' leaves us unable to say what happened in that case; but by 1725 the 78-card pack was probably no longer in use in either Florence or Rome. Hence, apart from the Tarot de Marseille and its Piedmontese variant (which may not as yet have reached Piedmont itself), the Tarocco Bolognese was probably at that date the only pack that still included the Papal figures.

---

[13] See *Playing cards of various ages and countries selected from the Collection of Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, vol. III, London, 1895, p. 14, where an account of the Montieri affair is quoted from a manuscript of 1820. This states that on 19 September 1725 the Papal Legate ordered 'che nel Gioco dei Tarocchi fossero sostituiti ai 4 Papi 4 Mori'. That the four *Papi* were treated in play as equal in rank is a deduction from the fact that this has certainly always been so for the four Moors (two of them even coincide in design), and the fact that Pisarri, in his careful account of how the manner of play of 'gli Antichi' differed from that in contemporary usage, gives no hint of a difference in this respect. Although he does not specifically mention the use of *Papi* in place of Moors, it can hardly be that the 'very old' manuscript from which he was quoting in 1754 dated from after 1725. Further corroboration comes from the fact that, in Mitelli's pack, in which the trumps are all unnumbered, as was then the practice in Bologna, there is no differentiation of subject between the two actual Popes, though the designs are not the same.

[14] An example of Montieri's pack in book form, is in the British Museum, no. I-43 in F.M. O'Donoghue's catalogue of the Lady Schreiber Collection. Illustrations will be found in *Playing cards of various ages and countries*, vol. III. An actual pack is in the collection of Mr David Temperley of Birmingham. A reproduction of the pack was published by the Edizioni del Solleone in 1973, edited by Signor Vito Arienti; it includes a very informative leaflet by Signor Franco Presicci. For an illustration of this reproduction pack, see S.R. Kaplan, op. cit., p. 147. A detailed discussion of the Montieri affair is contained in 'Il Governo "misto" in Bologna dal 1507 al 1797 e le carte da giuoco del Can. Montieri' by G.B. Comelli, *Atti e Memorie della Reale Deputazione di Storia Patria per la Romagna*, ser. 3, vol. XXVII, 1909.

[15] See Chapter 10.

The Tarocco Bolognese was one of the very first packs to become double-headed, adopting this practice some time between 1760 and 1780, a century before it was accepted in England. By contrast, it was the very last form of the Tarot pack to inscribe numerals on the trumps to indicate their order: this custom seems to have been introduced at the same time that the cards were made double-headed. Bolognese terminology differs from the norm principally in respect of the lowest trump, most usually called the *Bagatto* (with the stress on the second syllable). In Bologna in the eighteenth century it was called the *Bagattino*: now it is called the *Begato* (with the stress on the first syllable). The Fool is called the *Matto*, and the trumps are generically known as *trionfi*, or also, nowadays, simply as *numeri* (numbers). Nevertheless, the five lowest trumps – the *Begato* and the four Moors – and the four highest ones – the *Angelo*, *Mondo* (World), *Sole* (Sun) and *Luna* (Moon) – are left unnumbered: the numbering begins at 5 with the *Amore* (Love) and continues to the *Stella* (Star) as 16. The numbered trumps are nowadays referred to by their numbers: but before the introduction of the numerals on the trumps, a player had simply to remember the order of the trump subjects. The ranking of the trumps in Tarocchino, in descending order, is as follows, the names of the numbered trumps being those used in the eighteenth century before the introduction of the numerals: where necessary the more usual equivalent appellation has been indicated in brackets.

Angelo (Angel = Judgment)
Mondo (World)
Sole (Sun)
Luna (Moon)
16 – *Stella* (Star)
15 – *Saetta* (Thunderbolt = Tower)
14 – *Diavolo* (Devil)
13 – *Morte* (Death)
12 – *Traditore* (Traitor = Hanged Man)
11 – *Vecchio* (Old Man = Hermit)
10 – *Ruota* or *Roda* (Wheel)
9 – *Forza* (Strength = Fortitude)
8 – *Giustizia* (Justice)
7 – *Temperanza* or *Tempra* (Temperance)
6 – *Carro* (Chariot)
5 – *Amore* (Love)
The four *Mori* (Moors)
Bagattino or *Begato*.

Both now and in the eighteenth century, there are several games played with the Tarocco Bolognese, which have in common certain basic rules, of which the distinctive ones are those governing the different methods of scoring points. Both now and then, however, a four-handed game is regarded as the principal form. It will be easier to proceed by first describing the modern games, and then the older forms. The principal modern game is Ottocento: the basic rules are stated under that head.

Ottocento

Fundamentals

The game is for four players, who play in fixed partnerships of two each, partners facing each other across the table. Deal and play are counter-clockwise. The hands are played out in tricks, under the usual rules and the usual constraints; the Matto serves as

Excuse. Cards won in tricks by partners are kept face down in a single pile; when the Matto is played, it is withdrawn from the centre of the table and placed with the cards won in tricks by that side. If the other side wins the trick to which the Matto is played, the side who played it surrender any one card they have won, at their choice, to their opponents at the end of the round. If the side playing the Matto does not win any trick, they must surrender the Matto at the end of the round to their opponents: in no other circumstances can the Matto be lost. The Matto may be led to a trick; in that case, the second player may play any card, to which the third and fourth players must follow suit if they can, and, if they cannot, must play a trump if they can. The trumps rank, in descending order:

Angelo, *Mondo*, *Sole*, *Luna*, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, the four Moors, *Begato*.

If two or more Moors are played to a trick, the one played last beats the others. The suit cards rank in their original order, that is, in Swords and Batons:

K, Q, C, J, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, A

and, in Cups and Coins:

K, Q, C, J, A, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

Points on cards

The counting cards, with their values, are:

Angelo	5 points
Mondo	5 points
Begato	5 points
Matto	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each Cavallo	3 points
Each Jack	2 points

There are also 6 points for winning the last trick. The Angelo, Mondo, Begato and Matto are collectively called *tarocchi*: the *tarocchi* and the Kings are collectively called *carte da cinque* (cards worth 5 points). The cards are counted in twos. All twenty counting cards, taken together with twenty low cards, score 76 points. There remain twenty-two low cards, together making 11 points, to give, with the 6 points for the last trick, a total of 93 points in all.

Deal and discard

The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player, in three rounds of five to each, starting with the player on his right. He takes the last two cards for himself, without showing them, and discards two cards, again without showing them. He may not discard *carte da cinque*, i.e. *tarocchi* or Kings, but may discard any other card, including trumps. The two cards discarded by the dealer count at the end of the round to his side, unless they have made no tricks at all, when they must surrender them to their opponents. The deal passes in rotation after each round.

Declarations (Melds)

The player to the right of the dealer always leads to the first trick. Each player, just before he himself plays to the first trick, may declare any one or more of certain special combinations of cards, if he holds them in his hand. He is not bound to make these declarations, if he does not wish to, and may, if he wishes, declare fewer cards of a given combination than he actually has. He must lay down all the cards that he declares of any combination face up on the table for the other players to see. Such declarations score points for the side to which the player making them belongs, and are noted down: these points are added in to the points made on cards won in tricks at the end of the round. The dealer may not include in a declaration the cards he has discarded.

There are two kinds of combination: sets of three or four cards, called *cricche*, and sequences. The possible *cricche* are:

Three *tarocchi*	18 points
Four *tarocchi*	36 points
Three Kings	17 points
Four Kings	34 points
Three Queens	14 points
Four Queens	28 points
Three Cavalli	13 points
Four Cavalli	26 points
Three Jacks	12 points
Four Jacks	24 points

Three or more *cricche* together form a *criccone*, and all the points for *cricche* are then doubled.

There are seven kinds of sequence. Four of these are the sequences in each of the four suits. To have a sequence in a suit, you must have the King and any two of the remaining three court cards; if you have all four court cards of a suit, you may count them all as belonging to the sequence; and, if you have the King and at least two other court cards and also the Ace of the suit, you may include the Ace in the sequence. Other numeral cards may not be included in a suit sequence. A sequence in trumps is called a *grande* or *granda*. To have a *grande*, you must have the *Angelo* and at least two of the next three trumps, the *Mondo, Sole* and *Luna*: if you have all three of these, you may count them all as part of the *grande*. In addition, you may count as part of the *grande* any of the numbered trumps from 16 down in unbroken sequence. There are two remaining sequences, which are not sequences in the literal sense: a sequence of Moors, consisting of three or of all four Moors, and a sequence of Aces, consisting of three or of all four Aces. The Aces may be used both to make a sequence of Aces and in their respective suit sequences.

The Begato and the Matto are called, in this connection, *contatori*, and have a special, and twofold, privilege. First, they may function as wild cards, able, within certain limits, to substitute for certain cards needed to make up a sequence. The restrictions are these. A *contatore* cannot substitute for a King or the *Angelo*: a suit sequence must really have the King, a *grande* must really have the *Angelo*. Further, a suit sequence must really have at least one of the court cards below the King: you cannot make a sequence of the King and two *contatori*, but you may make one of the King, one other court card, and one *contatore*, and can add in the Ace if you have it. Likewise, a *grande* must really have at least one of the three unnumbered cards higher than the 16: you cannot make a *grande* of the *Angelo* and two *contatori*, but you can make one out of the *Angelo*, one of the *Mondo*, *Sole* and *Luna*, and one *contatore*, and add in any trumps in sequence down from the 16 that you have. A sequence of Moors must have at least two genuine Moors; a sequence of Aces must have at least two genuine Aces. It is important to note that the same *contatore* may be used repeatedly for this purpose, to replace different cards in different sequences. The second privilege of the *contatori* is that either or both may be added to any sequence, even if they are not needed to replace missing cards. Again, they may be used repeatedly for this purpose. Thus, if you have all four court cards and the Ace of Batons, and both *contatori*, you may claim a sequence of seven cards in Batons, whereas, without the *contatori*, the maximum length of a suit sequence is five; and if you have, as well, the other three Aces, you may claim a sequence of six in Aces, consisting of the four Aces and the two *contatori*. It is only with sequences that the *contatori* have either of these two privileges: they play no role in *cricche*, except in virtue of their being *tarocchi*.

In a *grande*, either or both *contatori* may also be used to replace missing numbered cards. Of course, no one *contatore* may be used to replace more than one missing card in any sequence, nor may a *contatore* be added to a sequence if it has already been used to replace a missing card. So if you have the *Angelo*, the *Sole*, one *contatore* and the 15, you can claim only a *grande* of three, because you need the *contatore* to substitute for the *Mondo* or the *Luna*, and do not have the 16. But, if you have the *Angelo*, the *Sole*, the 16 and 14 and two *contatori*, you can claim a *grande* of six: one *contatore* goes to replace the *Mondo*, and the other to replace the 15. This is subject to the restriction that you cannot use both *contatori* to replace two adjacent numbered trumps, for instance the 16 and 15, or the 14 and 13. Thus if you have the *Angelo*, *Mondo*, 15 and 14, with both *contatori*, you can claim a *grande* of six (one *contatore* replaces the *Sole* and the other the 16); but if you have the *Angelo*, *Mondo*, *Luna* and 14, with both *contatori*, you cannot include the 14 in your *grande*, which therefore, with the *contatori*, comprises only five cards.

All sequences score only according to the number of cards they contain: 10 points for a sequence of three, and 5 additional points for each card beyond three. A sequence of six thus scores 25 points. All scores for sequences are doubled, however, if you have three or more of them.

The final score

If there were only the scores for cards won in tricks, for the last trick and for *cricche* and sequences declared during the first trick, the Bolognese form of Tarocchi would not differ very markedly from other Tarot games. Its salient feature, however, is that, at the end of each round, each side scores points, not only in these ways, but also for any *cricche* and sequences that can be made out of the cards the two partners have together won in tricks. Naturally, there will normally be a great many more of these than ones which individual players could declare on their initial hands. They are scored for in exactly the same way as those declared during the first trick. The only remark that needs to be made is that, if a side should be lucky enough to have a *grande* extending, with the possible help of *contatori*, down to the 5, it may count as belonging to the *grande* any Moors that it may also have, scoring separately for a sequence of Moors if it has one. The scores for *cricche* and sequences at the end of play will usually swamp the points won on individual cards.

In order to compute the scores made by each side for *cricche* and sequences, it is usual for *one* side to lay out its cards, or the relevant ones, in rows and columns: it is possible then to see quickly both what *cricche* and sequences that side has, and also what the other side has. There are five columns, for trumps and for each of the four suits. The cards laid out in suits are the court cards and the Aces. Those laid out in trumps are the *tarocchi* and the Moors, together with any cards belonging to the *grande*, if that side has the *Angelo*. If the side that does not have the *Angelo* is laying out the cards, they include as many trumps as are needed to determine whether the other side has a *grande*, and, if so, of what length.

Consider the lay-out at the top of p. 323.

This side has two *cricche*, namely three *tarocchi*, scoring 18 points, and three Cavalli, scoring 13 points, making 31 points together. It has three sequences: a *grande* of five (*Angelo*, *Mondo*, *Begato*, 16, 15), scoring 20

Trumps	Swords	Batons	Cups	Coins
Angelo	K		K	
Mondo				Q
	C	C		C
		J		J
16	A	A	A	
15				
One Moor				
Begato				

points; a sequence of four in Swords (King, *Begato*, Cavallo, Ace), scoring 15 points; and a sequence of four Aces (three genuine Aces and the *Begato*), also scoring 15 points. This makes a total of 50 points, which is doubled because there are three sequences, to make 100 points for sequences altogether: 131 points for both *cricche* and sequences. The opponents have one *cricca* of three Queens, scoring 14 points. They have two sequences, one of three cards in Batons (King, Queen, Matto), scoring 10 points, and one of four cards in Moors (three genuine Moors and the Matto), scoring 15 points. They have, therefore, 39 points for *cricche* and sequences. If the other side had been laying out the cards, they would have put out all their court cards and Aces, together with the *Sole*, *Luna*, 14, three Moors and Matto. Since the first side had only one *contatore*, namely the *Begato*, which they needed to replace the *Sole* in order to form their *grande*, it is necessary for their opponents to put out only one numbered trump to show where the *grande* ends; if the first side had had, in addition, the *Sole, Luna* or Matto, their opponents would have needed to lay out the 13 as well as the 14.

If we assume that the side laying out the cards in this example won the last trick and has, besides the cards in the lay-out, fifteen low cards, it will have scored 53 points on the cards, making in all 131 + 53 = 184 points (plus any for initial declarations); the opponents will therefore have scored 93 − 53 = 40 points on the cards, making a total of 39 + 40 = 79 points (plus those for initial declarations). The scores in this example are comparatively low.

At the end of each round, the score for each side is rounded up or down to the nearest multiple of 5, and is usually recorded as the result of dividing the rounded total by 5, e.g. a score of 192 as 38. Both sides record their score for each round, a running total being kept, and that side wins the game which, in several rounds, first reaches 800 points (160 reduced points). If a side can do this by means of declarations during the first trick, it has won the game; otherwise the round must be played out, and, if both sides have reached 800 points, that with the higher score is the winner.

There are three signals that a player, while leading to a trick, is permitted to make to his partner: they are such as to be apparent to the opponent also – secret signals are illegal. A *busso* is effected by striking the table with the closed fist: it asks the partner to play his highest card in the suit led and to return it if he wins. The *volo* is executed by tossing the card lightly in the air so that it 'flies' down to the table, and signals that the player has no more cards in that suit. It may be accompanied by the *busso*, in which case the intention is either to trump the opponents' court cards in that suit, to save an important trump or to exhaust the trumps in the hands of the player making the signal, so that he can then throw his high cards on his partner's tricks. If not accompanied by the *busso*, however, it warns the partner not to lead that suit again. Finally, the *striscio* is made only when leading trumps, and is done by scraping the card led across the table. It invites the partner to lead trumps as much as possible, if he deems it advisable; one motive may be to capture the Begato, and another that the player making the signal has very few trumps, and wishes to exhaust them for the same reason as before.

The *busso* and *volo* signals occur also in Tressette, but in that game are made verbally. The play of Ottocento needs extreme care, because there are only twenty cards in the pack – the 6 to 10 of each suit – that cannot contribute to forming a *cricca* or sequence. As in all Tarot games, the Begato is highly vulnerable; but here it is of prime importance, not only as being a *tarocco* but above all because of its role as a *contatore*; it may, for example, enable the side that saves or captures it to form three sequences where, without it, they would have formed only one. The Kings are also of great importance, not only as forming a valuable *cricca* but because they are essential for sequences in the plain suits. Having secured two sequences, it is an important objective to obtain a third, since that will double the scores for all of them; note that at least one side must have a sequence of Aces, and at least one must have a sequence of Moors. All court cards are obviously important; the side which lacks the *Angelo* will want to ensure an early gap in the opponents' trump sequence. A player must try to keep in mind which of the many important cards have been captured by his side or by the opponents, but must be ready to make sacrifices; too exclusive a concentration on a single objective can easily ruin a game.

There are five other games currently played with the Tarocco Bolognese, which will now be described.

Terziglio

This is a three-handed game, with a rudimentary form of bidding. Eighteen cards are dealt out in three rounds of six each, starting with the player on the dealer's right. The remaining eight cards are placed face down in the centre of the table. One of the players is to play alone against the other two. The bidding is opened by the player on the dealer's right. He may pass if he likes, or make a positive bid, of which there are only two: 'Gioco' ('I play'), also colloquially effected by saying, 'Se si può' ('If it is possible'); and 'Solo'. Suppose that he makes the lower of the two bids, 'Gioco', and that the other two players pass. The first player then picks up the eight cards from the centre of the table, without showing them to the other two players, and adds them to his hand. He then discards eight cards face down beside him on the table; he may not discard Kings or *tarocchi*. These eight cards will count for him at the end of the round like the cards he wins in tricks, unless he is unfortunate enough to win no tricks, in which case they are surrendered to the opponents. The hands are then played out in the usual way, the player to the dealer's right leading to the first trick; each player, before playing to the first trick, may declare *cricche* or sequences. The opponents of the declarer keep the cards they win in a single pile. At the end of the round, points for cards, for the last trick and for *cricche* and sequences included either in the cards won by the declarer or in those of the opponents taken together are calculated as in Ottocento. The cards are counted in twos: an odd low card does not count, an odd counting card scores 1 point less than its nominal value. If the total score of the declarer exceeds that of the opponents, he has won; if it is equal or less, he has lost. If the declarer wins, his total score is rounded to a multiple of 50: if it falls short of a multiple of 50 by 4 points or fewer, it is rounded up, otherwise it is rounded down (thus 296 is rounded to 300, 295 to 250). He then scores as game points one more than the result of dividing this rounded total by 50; his opponents score nothing. If the declarer loses, he scores nothing, and each of his opponents scores the same number of game points, calculated in the same way on their combined total point score. If, however, the declarer has made a *capotto* (slam), that is, has won all the tricks, he scores 40 game points, and conversely if he has lost them all.

If the first player passes, the second player may then either pass or make a positive bid; and, if he passes, the third player has the option. A player who has passed cannot re-enter the bidding. It is very rare for the second player to pass, because of the danger that the third player will make a *capotto*. If the second player says 'Gioco', and is not overbid by the third player, all proceeds as before, save that the declarer must show the eight cards from the centre of the table to the other two players before taking them into his hand. It is still the player to the dealer's right who leads to the first trick. The procedure is the same if the first two players pass, and the third says 'Gioco'.

If the first player has said 'Gioco', the second or the third player may overbid him by saying 'Solo'; likewise, if the second player says 'Gioco', the third may say 'Solo'. In such a case, the player who opened the bidding does *not* have the right to claim to play the Solo instead; he must simply become one of the opponents. It is also allowed for the first positive bid made to be 'Solo'. When a Solo is played, the eight cards in the centre of table are set aside unlooked at, and belong, at the end of play, to the winner of the last trick; the player to the dealer's right still leads to the first trick. The number of game points won by declarer or opponents is doubled when a Solo is played.

When four take part in Terziglio, the dealer sits out the round, and scores the same as the opponents of the declarer. At Monzuno, near Bologna, a variation is played in which nineteen cards are dealt to each player, and only five are placed in the centre of the table. Terziglio is extremely difficult, because it is very hard to estimate, from a hand, what score is likely.

Millone

This is a popular two-handed game. The dealer gives twenty cards to himself and his opponent, in four rounds of five each, and, in the last round, gives two extra cards to himself. Each then discards ten cards face down, which will count to him at the end, unless he makes no tricks; he may not discard Kings or *tarocchi*. The dealer then deals ten more cards to each player, in two rounds of five each, and himself discards two more cards. Some play instead that, before the discard of ten each, the dealer gives himself only twenty cards, taking twelve on the completion of the deal after that discard; but this is not the original rule. Declarations, play and scoring for cards won in tricks, for the last trick and for *cricche* and sequences are as usual; the opponent of the dealer leads to the first trick, and the cards are counted in twos. Each player records his score at the end of each round, and a running total is kept. The game is completed at the end of that round in which one or both players reached 1,000 points, and is won by the player who then has the higher score. If, during any deal, either player finds himself able to reach 1,000 points by making declarations of *cricche* and sequences on his first twenty or twenty-two cards, before he has discarded, he may do so, and wins the game. Once each has discarded his ten cards, however, the round must be played out to the end before the winner can be determined. Except in the case mentioned, declarations can be made only on the cards held in hand after the discard.

Centino

This is another two-handed game, played with a reduced pack of forty-two cards, from which all the numeral cards save the Aces have been omitted from all four suits. Each player receives only five cards in the deal, and there is no discard for the dealer. Any player who has a *cricca* or a sequence can declare it before playing to the first trick, and the points for it are noted: but, at the end of the round, when the total points for the round are reckoned, only the player with the higher total score records it and adds it to his running total. The first player, in any number of rounds, to gain 100 points wins the game: he receives 1 game point if his opponent has attained 50 points or more, 2 game points if he has not.

Centocinquanta

This is yet another two-handed game, in which the full pack is used; the dealer gives fifteen cards to each, in three rounds of five each, and takes an additional two for himself in the last round of the deal; he discards two cards, under the usual rules. Declarations and play are as usual. At the end of the round, the points of each player are reckoned in the usual way, and then rounded to the nearest multiple of 10: 25 points are rounded up to 30, 24 points are rounded down to 20. The recorded score is the rounded total divided by 10. The game is won by the first player to reach 150 points as recorded. (Some, however, prefer to play to 200 up.) When the players are approaching the winning score of 150, there are some special rules. The dealer, if he is close to 150 points, leaves the last two cards face down on the table, and looks at his hand before picking them up. If by declaring *cricche* and sequences he can reach the winning score, he may declare them immediately, winning the game before his opponent has a chance to make his declarations, and however close his opponent was to the winning score. If the dealer cannot do this, he picks up the two extra cards and discards. If, now, the dealer's opponent can reach the winning score by declaring *cricche* and sequences, he declares them and wins the game. In any other case, the last round must be played out; this applies even if the dealer can, after his discard, make declarations that bring him up to the winning score. If both players attain 150 points (as recorded) in the course of the last round, the one who has the higher grand total wins.

Mattazza

This is a very popular reversed game which may be played by any number of players from two to six; the most usual number is four. Ten cards are dealt to each player, in two rounds of five each, and there is no discard. Each player plays for himself, and, in each round, there is a loser, or sometimes more than one loser, rather than a winner. There are no initial declarations. The loser, in any round, is the player who makes the *most* points, on cards won in tricks, on the last trick, and on *cricche* and sequences included in the cards he has won. The cards are counted in sets equal to the number of players, e.g. in fours in the four-handed game. If two or more players make an equal number of points, greater than that made by any other player, both (or all) are losers. If, however, a player makes no points at all, that is, wins no trick, then he is the loser, and the player with the most points does not lose; if two or more players make no points, both or all are losers. After each round, one adverse game point is marked to the loser, or to each loser if there is more than one. The game ends when either two players have each scored three or more adverse game points, or one player has scored six: in the former case, the two players who have scored three or more adverse points pay the rest between them; in the latter case, the one player with six adverse points pays all the rest on his own. In any round, at any stage, a player with a strong hand may say '*A duro*'. This is an invitation to any other player who cares to co-operate to join with him in trying to deny tricks to the other players, or at least to one of them. If they succeed, the player or players with no tricks will become the losers; but, of course, if they fail, one of them will almost certainly be the loser, and it is very difficult to prevent a trick, especially the last one, from inadvertently going to a player who has so far made none. If a player chooses to co-operate with one who has said '*A duro*', he may not announce the fact in any way: it becomes evident only through the play. The score is usually kept by drawing spokes of a wheel on the table to each player (when there are four, it forms a cross), and marking a short line across the appropriate spoke to indicate the adverse points awarded to losers. Note that the player with the Matto can at the end of the round give in exchange for it to the one who took the trick to which it was played that card which most increases the latter's point-total.

It is convenient next to describe the most ancient form of the game of which we have an account, that contained in the old manuscript from which Pisarri carefully cites all the differences from the eighteenth-century game. I shall assume that this manuscript was at least fifty years old, and therefore recorded the seventeenth-century form of the game. It is surprising in two ways. First, because every detail of the modern game featured in its ancestor of three centuries ago: this extraordinary conservatism makes it highly likely that the present-day game is, in all essentials, the same as that invented in the sixteenth century. It is surprising, secondly, because, while Ottocento appears complicated enough, the seventeenth-century game is even more complicated. In fact, in its basic structure it is almost exactly identical with Ottocento: but, superimposed on this, there is an additional level of complexity which has subsequently simply been shorn off. Pisarri does not describe the earlier form of the game all at once, but merely notes its differences from the eighteenth-century form as he goes along; but I base the following account on his express assurance that he has recorded all the differences. As now, the principal game in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a four-handed one; the earlier game was called Partita.

Partita in the seventeenth century

Four players take part, in fixed partnerships of two each, the partners facing each other across the table. There is no game, to be won or lost over several rounds: a settlement is made after each round (or after an arbitrary number of rounds), in the manner explained below. The deal, play and allocation of points for cards, *cricche* and sequences are all as in Ottocento, save in the respects to be stated.

Terminology

The same terms are used as in modern Bolognese Tarocchi, save that the lowest trump is called the *Bagattino*, the trumps are called only *trionfi*, not *numeri*, and are all referred to individually by name, *Papi* replace the Moors, and the term *pariglie* is used as an alternative to *cricche*.

Deal

After the first five cards are dealt to each player, the players look at them. If all four players agree, it will be possible to *andare a monte*, literally 'to go to the mountain'; that is, the cards will be thrown in and the player to the dealer's right will shuffle the pack and become dealer for a fresh deal. (This used to be a very general Italian practice in a great many card games; it is referred to by Francesco Berni in his *Capitolo della Primiera* of 1526 as a peculiarity of the game of Ronfa.) The player to the dealer's right speaks first: he may say either '*La tengo*' ('I hold') or '*A monte*'. If he says '*La tengo*', the dealer resumes giving out the cards. If the first player says '*A monte*', the dealer's partner may then do one of three things: he may say '*A monte*', indicating that he has very bad cards; or he may say '*Ho cattivo, regolatevi con le vostre*' ('I have bad cards, decide it on the basis of your own'); or he may simply put his cards face down on the table without saying anything, indicating that he does not wish to go *a monte*, but without definitely making it impossible. Whatever the second player does, the third player now has the right to say either '*La tengo*' or '*A monte*'. If he says '*La tengo*', then, as before, the dealer must resume dealing out the remaining cards. If he says '*A monte*', then the dealer must determine, from his own cards and what his partner has said, whether to resume the deal or to throw in his cards; his actions show what he has decided. As will be seen, if either of the opponents of the dealer holds, i.e. says '*La tengo*', he increases the stake for the round: if the opponents win the round, they will gain more, if they lose the round, the dealer and his partner will gain more. The dealer, on the other hand, risks nothing by continuing the deal.

Play

The declarations during the first trick are as in Ottocento, save for certain additional declarations to be noted under *Scoring*. The play is just as in Ottocento, save for the signals that a player may make to his partner. The first is the expression '*Sminchiate*', by which, when a player has the lead, his partner may instruct him to lead his highest trump. Pisarri remarks that originally this was the only signal allowed to be given. Secondly, if a player chooses, when playing a card, to strike (*battere*) the table in the middle, he informs his partner that he holds the highest card of that suit, including trumps, not yet played; if he strikes the table at the side, he indicates that he has the second highest card of the suit. Finally, in leading to a trick, he may choose to draw back (*tirare indietro*) the card slightly towards himself before laying it down, by which he signals that he does not want his partner to take the trick, or, at least, to play his highest card. Only one of these three signals may be given at a time.

Points

The allocation of points for *cricche* and sequences, either declared during the first trick or in cards won in tricks at the end of the round, is exactly as in Ottocento, and there are 6 points for the last trick. However, the cards are counted in fours, not in twos. The dealer and his partner will have two extra cards: two such low cards count nothing. (If counting cards are included in the two odd cards, each counts 1 less than its nominal value.) There are 31 pairs of cards in the pack, and only 15 sets of four, so that the total number of points on cards, including the 6 for the last trick, is 77, exclusive of *cricche* and sequences, of course.

Scoring

The principal difference between Ottocento and Partita lies in the fact that, in the latter, there is an additional scoring system superimposed on the allocation of points. This was done by means of chips (in the sense of Poker chips) called *pesi*. A single bowl was on the table, and a side placed in the bowl the number of *pesi* that it had won; the number of *pesi* still possessed by a side, or, rather, the difference between that number and the number possessed by the opponents, indicated how much they owed. This is confusing for a modern reader, and I will instead speak of chips (*pesi*) being awarded to a side. Since it is on the basis of the chips that the settlement was made, they could be called game points; but it is more convenient to refer to them simply as chips. Chips have two functions: partly to represent points, 1 chip being equivalent to 25 points, and partly as independent bonuses; some of these bonuses are for things that do not in themselves score points, and thus affect the play of the game.

A round is won by the side that obtains the higher total number of points in that round. The point-total of the winning side is rounded *down* to the next highest multiple of 25, e.g. 374 is rounded down to 350. The winning side is then awarded the number of chips that results from dividing that rounded total by 25; the losing side obtains nothing. If the winning side has obtained 500 points, it also gains an additional bonus of 20 chips, and 10 more chips for each 100 points above 500. Thus a score of 729 obtains 29 chips plus a bonus of 40 chips, making 69 chips in all. If a side has given *marcio* (slam) to its opponents, i.e. has made all the tricks, the number of chips is doubled. Since there are 846 points for all possible *cricche* and sequences, when *marcio* is given the winning side will have 846 + 77 = 923 points, i.e. 36 chips plus 60 chips bonus; the total of 96 chips, when doubled, yields 192 chips. It was, however, frequently the custom to award 200 chips for giving *marcio*. If the winning side are the opponents of the dealer, they gain 5 additional chips for not having had the advantage of the discard; if they said '*La tengo*' during the deal, they gain a further 5 chips. If, however, the opponents of the dealer said '*La tengo*', and the dealer and his partner win, they gain 5 additional chips. If the dealer throws in his cards and goes *a monte*, the opponents are awarded 5 chips. There is a bonus of 10 chips for being the first to win a round. If the winners obtain 500 points without having the *Angelo*, then, in addition to all that has gone before, they obtain a further bonus of 10 chips; if they have 600 points without the *Angelo*, this bonus is increased to 20 chips, and, if 700, to 30 chips. If the winners, whatever their score, have neither *contatore*, they gain an additional 10 chips.

When *cricche* and sequences are declared during the first trick, the points so obtained are recorded by means of counters called *lupini* or *ferlini*, quite distinct from the chips. Each counter represents 10 points, but the points are first rounded *down* to the next highest multiple of 10, so that a player who declares a *cricca* of Queens and a sequence of four, thus obtaining 29 points, may take only 2 counters. At the end of the round, the number of counters is multiplied by 10 to obtain the points to be added to the points on cards, and those on *cricche* and sequences among the cards won, in order to determine how many points each side has and, thus, which has won the round. In addition, however, the winning side is awarded twice as many chips as the total number of counters belonging either to themselves or to their opponents; declarations are therefore dangerous if you do not have a chance of winning the round. Furthermore, there are bonuses in chips for some, but not for all, the regular declarations, and also for some declarations that do not score points. 10 chips are awarded for declaring three Kings, three *tarocchi* or three *Papi*; 20 chips for declaring four of any of these kinds. Declarations of *cricche* of Queens, Cavalli or Jacks do not in themselves gain any chips: but if a player declares a *criccone* of three *cricche*, his side obtains 20 chips, if he declares one of four *cricche*, they obtain 40 chips, and, for one of five *cricche*, 80 chips. A declaration of three sequences gains 10 chips, of four sequences 20 chips, of five sequences 40 chips and of six sequences 80 chips. There are three kinds of declaration which score no points, but are to be made, if the player wishes, in the usual way, namely just before playing his card to the first trick, and showing all the cards to the other players. One consists of ten or more trumps; for this purpose the Matto may be counted as a trump. Ten trumps are awarded 10 chips, eleven trumps 20 chips, twelve trumps 40 chips, thirteen trumps 80 chips, fourteen trumps 160 chips and fifteen trumps 320 chips. The second consists of ten or more *cartaccie*, that is, numeral cards of the plain suits; the Matto may again be counted as a *cartaccia* (but the Bagattino may not). The scores in chips are the same as for ten or more trumps. The third kind is a declaration by a player that he has no trumps in his hand, in which case he must show his whole hand. For this his side is awarded 20 chips. If the declaration is made by the dealer, however, he must put his two discarded cards on one side, and show them at the end of the round; if they contain a trump, his side must surrender 10 of the 20 chips.

Finally, if one side captures the Bagattino or the Mondo in play from the other side, it gains a bonus of 5 chips.

The scoring system is complicated, but does not affect the game as much as one might at first think, since, for the most part, the feats for which the bonuses are awarded are fairly rare. It seems clear that the accretion of this system of chips and bonuses must have taken place gradually after the invention of the game; but this reinforces our conclusion that the basic structure of the game must date back to its original invention, since it takes time for such a superstructure to be erected. Probably, therefore, the way in which the game is now played is closer to how it was first played in the sixteenth century than at any previous time, save that counting the cards in fours was almost certainly the original practice. The custom of counting them in twos must reflect a period when the various two-handed games were more popular than the four-handed one.

Partita, as described by Pisarri as being played in his own day, is very similar to the seventeenth-century form, save for some modifications and further complications of the scoring system. The principal difference lies in the growth of an elaborate system of signals. These have now all become verbal signals, and in effect allow one of the two partners to direct the play, while the other gives him (and his opponents) information about his hand. However, it is not permitted for the players to say anything they like to their partners: information or instructions must be conveyed only by means of set conventional formulas, and Pisarri rejects many formulas in actual use as unlawful because excessively informative. Here I shall indicate only the principal ones; full details will be found in the appendix.

Partita in the eighteenth century

All is as in the seventeenth-century form, save for the exceptions here stated. Moors replace the *Papi*.

Deal

Instead of saying '*La tengo*' or '*A monte*', the player to the right of the dealer may, after the first round of the deal, say '*Come vuole*'. By this he indicates to his partner that he has fairly strong cards, but not strong enough to say '*La tengo*' outright. (Pisarri's recommendations are startlingly strict: he advises the first player to say '*La tengo*' only if he has three of the eight *carte de cinque* in his first five cards.) Pisarri frowns somewhat on this practice, but admits it to be widespread.

Chips

The chips are now called *partite*, and there are also large chips called *Oche*, 1 *Oca* simply representing 10 *partite*. Instead of both sides putting chips into a central bowl, each side has a bowl into which they put the chips they have gained.

The awards of chips remain the same, with the following exceptions. The number of chips gained is no longer doubled for giving *marcio* (slam). A declaration, during the first trick, of five sequences gains only 30 chips, one of six sequences only 40. A declaration of a *criccone* still gains 20 chips, but there is no increase for declaring four or five *cricche*. At the end of the round, the winning side may claim only as many chips as the total number of counters belonging both to them and to their opponents (to record the points on declarations during the first trick), not twice as many, as in the earlier form of the game.

Game points

In the eighteenth-century game, there is superimposed upon the system of chips yet a further level of game points, in terms of which settlement is made. A game (*partita*) is concluded when, after several rounds, one side has reached 150 chips. The game comes to an end as soon as this happens, even if it is in the middle of a round, as a result either of the bonus for capturing the Bagattino or the *Mondo*, or of the declarations during the first trick: for this purpose, note that while the bonus for capturing a *tarocco* is gained only on the completion of the trick, that for a declaration is gained as soon as the declaration is made. The winners of the game acquire 1 game point if their opponents have gained 75 chips or more, 2 if they have less than 75 chips, and 3 if they have no chips at all. There are, however, additional bonuses of game points in the course of the game. A side that wins a round by making 500 points or more gains a bonus of 1 game points, plus 1 additional game point for every 100 points above 500; and a side that gives *marcio* (slam) to the other, i.e. wins all the tricks in the round, obtains an additional bonus of 1 game point.

Instructions and information

By the eighteenth century, the custom had developed of allowing a player to advise his partner what to play, or to give his partner information about his own hand, by means of a large number of partly conventional expressions. A player could do this on either of two occasions: either when his partner had the lead, and before he led his card; or as he himself played a card to a trick, whether he was leading or not. He was not, however, permitted to give whatever instruction or piece of information he chose: he could do so only by means of certain set formulas, called, rather oddly, *giuochi* (games), of which he was not permitted to use more than one at a time. This meant that, in order to be able to play the game, one had to learn by heart all these phrases and their significance. In practice, that one of the two partners who had the stronger hand would assume direction of the play, the other merely supplying him with information about his hand. No rule of the game required a player to follow the instruction given to him by his partner, though for some instructions it was considered bad play not to do so, for others not. Equally, no rule forbade a player to mislead his opponents by using a phrase indicating that he had certain cards when in fact he did not; obviously, however, such a practice was very dangerous, and only to be undertaken when there was no danger of seriously misleading his partner. Not surprisingly, there was disagreement about which expressions should be allowed; Pisarri cites a large number which he regards as improper, as giving an excessive amount of information, but which were in use among some players.

I give here only the most important of the phrases (*giuochi*) listed by Pisarri; others will be found in the Appendix to this chapter (pp. 335-7). First are those which may be used when the partner is about to lead to a trick.

Sminchi; also *Sminchi il piú bello* – Lead your highest trump. (The difference in the form of the verb from the earlier '*Sminchiate*' merely registers the eighteenth-century introduction of the polite use, in addressing another person, of the third person singular in place of the second person plural.)

La posso servire d'un piccolo (I can help you by means of a little one) – I have the leading trump; lead a small one to it.

Tiri de' trionfetti (Draw small trumps). – Lead a fairly low trump, but not the lowest; continue to do so when you next get the lead.

Giochi (Play) – Lead the suit in which I announced a sequence.

Giochi con loro (Play with theirs) – Lead the suit in which the opponents announced a sequence.

Giochi di queste (Play these) – Lead the suit just played.

Giochi le sue (Play your own) – Lead a King, particularly one you showed in an announcement.

Giochi sempre le sue (Keep on playing your own) – Lead out all your certain winners.

Giochi pur sempre (Keep on playing) – Lead that suit in which the opponents have a card they are anxious to save.

Li faccia andare (Make them go) – Lead a suit in which the opponents are short, to force their trumps.

Next are the phrases that may be used when playing a card to a trick, whether or not he is leading to it. There is one signal given without words, namely when a player draws back (*tira indietro*) his card before laying it down: this signifies that the player wishes his partner to let the trick go, and not attempt to take it, or, at least, not to play his highest card on it. The principal phrases used are as follows:

Batto (I strike) – I have the leading card (in the suit being played, or in trumps if trumps are being played). (By the eighteenth century the word had replaced the action.)

Batto indietro (I strike behind) – I have the second highest card not yet played (in the suit being played, or in trumps).

Sono in qualche luogo (I am somewhere) – (When the trick is in trumps) I have one of the three trumps after the *Angelo*; (when the trick is in a suit) I have the Cavallo or the Jack.

Stricco – I have just one more card left (in the suit being played, or in trumps if trumps are being played).

Striccando – I have just two more cards left (in the suit being played, or in trumps).

There are also phrases for indicating any number of cards left up to four in a suit, or up to nine in trumps:

In casa (At home) – (When a suit is being played) play the highest card you have in the suit; (when trumps are being played, and the partner has no more trumps) throw a King or other good card on the trick; the opponent to your right will not beat it.

Tiro a me (I draw to me) – I have the Bagattino but no other trump; keep your high trumps in order to save it.

Ci vada col più bello (Go here with the finest) – (Said only when the trick is in trumps) play your highest trump.

Ci vada con quello che ha (Go here with the one you have) – Play your highest card in this suit.

Copra solamente (Cover only) – Beat the opponent's card, but with a card as low as you can.

Volo (I fly) or *Vado* (I go) – I have the highest trump and no other.

There were also phrases that could be used after the first round of the deal to reveal one's holdings to one's partner, so as to help him decide whether or not to go *a monte*; but Pisarri totally disapproves of these.

Pisarri also briefly describes eleven other games played with the Tarocchino pack. He unfortunately fails to state whether the cards are always counted in fours or in sets equal to the number of players. His silence on this point might lead one to suppose that they were counted in fours, however many players were taking part; but it is difficult to believe this for all the two-handed games. The games are as follows.

Six-handed Partita

The six players are divided into two fixed partnerships of three each, members of opposing sides being seated alternately. Each player is dealt ten cards in two rounds of five each, the dealer taking the last two cards on the last round and discarding two; presumably both partners of the dealer have the same options in the *a monte* procedure as his single partner in the four-handed game. Everything proceeds as in four-handed Partita, with the following exceptions. In the declarations during the first trick, a player may declare two *tarocchi*, two Kings or two Moors. His side receives no points for such a declaration, but they gain 10 chips for each such pair. If a *cricca* of three *tarocchi* or Kings, or a sequence of three Moors, is declared, the side gains 20 chips, as well as the usual points. Furthermore, a player may declare three pairs of any of the kinds which form *cricche*, i.e. *tarocchi*, Kings, Queens, Cavalli and Jacks: no points are awarded, but the side gains 20 chips. If, for instance, a player declares two *tarocchi*, two Queens and two Jacks, his side gains 30 chips, 10 for the two *tarocchi* and 20 for the three pairs; if he declares three *tarocchi*, two Queens and three Jacks, they gain 40 chips, 20 for the three *tarocchi* and 20 for the three pairs, and the normal 30 points, 18 for the *cricca* of *tarocchi* and 12 for the *cricca* of Jacks. Sequences can be declared only under the usual rules; but a player declaring two sequences gains 10 chips for his side, or 20 chips for three sequences and 40 chips for four. A player who declares six trumps or six *cartaccie* gains 10 chips for his side, or 20 chips for seven, 40 chips for eight, and so on. The game is won by the side first obtaining 150 chips.

Partitaccia

This four-handed game is a simplified version of Partita, without chips: settlement is made at the end of each round on the basis of the points alone. It is the custom to change partners at the end of every four rounds. There are three ways of scoring. According to the simplest, the winners of any round each receive 1 game point, paid by one of the opponents, without regard to their score. Under the second method, the winners receive 1 game point each if they have a point-total below 500, 2 game points if they have 500 points or more. Or, finally, they may receive 1 game point each for less than 500 points, 2 if they have 500 but less than 600, 3 if they have 600 but less than 700, and so on. Pisarri states that, while this game is played in Bologna itself, it is particularly favoured in the countryside. It probably represents the original sixteenth-century game.

Milloni

This is exactly the modern game of Millone. The dealer gives himself his extra two cards at the end of the first stage of the deal, before the discard of ten cards by each player.

Mattaccia

The only difference between this and the modern game of Mattazza is that it is specified to be for five, six or more players, and that the number of cards dealt to each depends on the number of players (presumably twelve each to five players, ten each to six, eight each to seven, and so on). The expression '*Duro*' is used just as '*A duro*' is used now.

Quarantacinque

This can be played by two or by three players. Each receives ten cards, in two rounds of five each, and each keeps a running total of the points he makes. There is no discard for the dealer, but there are the usual declarations during the first trick and the usual rules governing points. The winner is the first player to reach 45 points. There are two variant forms.

In the first form, each *cricca* or sequence is reckoned at its exact value, and a player may claim to have reached 45 points, by saying '*Ho vinto*' ('I have won'), at any stage during a round. If his claim is sound, he wins the game, even if another player has more points than he. If his claim is false, the game comes to an end: his opponent wins, or, in the three-handed game, that one of his opponents who has the most points. If a player wins the game in a single round, he is paid double by each opponent; if in more than one round, he is paid singly by each. A player who has, in the course of a round, attained 45 points in virtue of his score on that round and on a previous round or rounds, may claim victory but elect to continue the round to the end: if he succeeds in scoring 45 points on that round alone, he is entitled to a double payment. However, if either of his opponents has, by the end of the round, reached a higher total score than the total score of that player, the game goes to that opponent, and the player who claimed victory is paid nothing.

In the other form, the points a player makes on *cricche* and sequences declared during the first trick are rounded up or down to the nearest multiple of 10, an odd multiple of 5 being rounded *up* (e.g. 15 is rounded up to 20). A player is not allowed to claim victory until a round has been completed. The game ends when, at the end of some round, at least one player has made 45 points or more as a running total: when more than one player has done so, the one with the highest score wins. In the two-handed game, the loser pays 1 game point to the winner if he has won in several rounds, and 2 game points if he has won in a single round. A variation is to add 1 game point for every 10 points by which the winner has surpassed 45 points: thus if he has 66 points, and has won in several rounds, he gets 3 game points; if he has 66 points in a single round, he gets 4 game points. In the three-handed game, there are again variations concerning the award of game points. On one method, if the game has been won in several rounds, the player with the fewest points pays 1 game point to the winner, the third player neither paying nor being paid; but, if the game has been won in a single round, each of the other two pays 1 game point to the winner. On another method, each opponent pays 1 game point when the game is won in several rounds, and 2 when it is won in a single round; and some add the additional game point for every 10 points above 45.

Settanta

Settanta is another two-handed game in which each player receives ten cards in two rounds of five, and there is no discard for the dealer. It also has two forms. In the first form, each *cricca* or sequence declared during the first trick counts the exact number of points at which it is valued, and the same holds for points on cards and on *cricche* and sequences at the end of the round. Play and scoring are subject to the usual rules, and the winner is the first to reach a running total of 70 points, which he may claim in the middle of a round, under the same procedure as in Quarantacinque.

The second variant is more interesting. Points on *cricche* and sequences declared during the first trick are rounded up or down to the nearest multiple of 10, an odd multiple of 5 being rounded *up* (e.g. 15 is rounded up to 20). The same happens to the points for cards and for *cricche* and sequences at the end of each round. At any stage of play, either player may propose to the other that the score for the last trick be doubled, to make 12 points. The opponent may do one of three things. He may refuse the proposal; in this case, the player who proposed the increase receives the usual 6 points for the last trick, whether he in fact wins or loses it. Or the opponent may accept the proposed increase; in this case whoever wins the last trick obtains 12 points. Or, finally, the opponent may propose a further increase to 18 points. In this last case, the first player has, in his turn, the same threefold option. He may refuse, in which case the second player will score 12 points for the last trick, whether he in fact wins or loses it. He may accept, in which case the winner of the last trick will score 18 points. Or he may propose a further increase to 24 points. This process is continued indefinitely until one player either accepts or refuses. Once any such proposal has been refused, no further proposals of the kind may be made in the course of the round; but, as long as they are accepted, several such proposals may be made at different times in a round. The game ends at the end of that round in which a player first reaches 70 points, and the player who then has the higher score is the winner.

Lecchini

Yet another two-handed game, each player being dealt ten cards in two rounds of five each, with no extra cards for the dealer. The remainder of the pack is placed face down in the centre of the table. After each trick, the winner of the trick draws the top card of the stock, shows it to his opponent, and adds it to his hand; the other player then draws the next card, shows it to the first player, and adds it to his hand. When the stock is exhausted, the hands are played out. In this way, all sixty-two cards will, at the end of the round, have been captured by one or other player. Before playing to the first trick, each player declares any *cricche* or sequences that he has in the usual way. If, in the course of the round, a player draws a card that can be added to any of the *cricche* or sequences he declared in the first trick, he may redeclare them, augmented by the new card, and score again for them, even though he no longer has some of the cards that originally went to make them up. He may do this as often as he draws such a card; moreover, if he originally had three or more *cricche*, and draws a card that augments one of them, he may redeclare all the *cricche*, and similarly with sequences. He may not, however, add to a sequence any card that he did not originally declare, other than that he has just drawn (e.g. if he originally declared a *grande*, and draws the *Stella* (16), he may not add in the *Saetta* (15) that he already had in his hand). In no case may a player declare a new *cricca* or sequence that he did not declare during the first trick. Some, however, allowed that, whenever a player made a redeclaration, he could redeclare *all* the *cricche* and sequences that he originally declared, even though the card he had drawn augmented only one of them. Furthermore, every time that a player has ten trumps in his hand, he may declare them, and scores 100 points for doing so: he does not need, in this case, to have declared ten trumps during the first trick. At the end of the round, there will be large point-totals.

There are two methods of scoring, resembling the older and the later forms of Partita. Under the first method, a settlement is made after each round of play. The winner's point-total, for declarations made during the course of play and for points on cards, *cricche* and sequences at the end of play, is rounded down to the next highest multiple of 25; he then receives, in chips, the result of dividing that figure by 25, and, in addition, 20 chips if he scored at least 500 points plus 10 additional chips for every 100 points above 500. Settlement is then on the basis of the chips so acquired. Under the second method, a game may take more than one round. Chips are awarded in accordance with the same principle as on the first method, and the first player to obtain 150 chips wins the game. If his opponent has obtained 75 chips or more, the winner obtains 1 game point; if he has fewer than 75 chips, he receives 2 game points. If a player wins any round with 500 points or more, he also gains 1 game point, plus one for each 100 points above 500, even though he has not yet reached game.

Toppa

Toppa is yet another two-handed game, but this time each player is dealt five cards only. Play and allocation of points are as usual, and the player who, in any round, has the higher point-total receives 1 game point. Whenever, during the course of play, a player captures from his opponent a King, the Mondo, a Moor or the Bagattino, he may say 'Toppa', and then receives 1 game point. If he forgets to say 'Toppa', he cannot claim the game point; some allow that, in this case, his opponent may say 'Toppa' instead, and claim 1 game point. If one player gives a *marcio* to the other, that is, wins every trick, and his opponent had the Matto, the Matto must, as usual, be surrendered to the winner at the end of the round: the winner may then say 'Toppa', and score an extra game point for doing so.

Centini

This is like the modern game of Centino, but differs from it in that the full 62-card pack is used instead of the shortened 42-card one. It differs also in having a four-handed as well as a two-handed form. In both forms, each player receives only five cards: the four-handed form is played with fixed partnerships, partners facing each other. The winning player or side is the one first reaching a running total of 100 points; if the other player or side has not reached 50 points, the loser or losers pay double.

Cinquina

This is another two-handed game in which each player is dealt five cards. Settlement is made after each round, on the basis of the number of points made by the winner; the loser's point-total makes no difference. The score was recorded in the same way as in seventeenth-century Partita, that is, by the winner's placing chips for his winnings into a single bowl on the table; but the chips simply represented the points.

Calini

This is one of the few Tarot games that is not a trick-taking game, but, rather, what was earlier called a 'fishing' game. It may be played by two or by three. The dealer gives three cards to each player, and places the next six cards face up, and separately, upon the table. Each player, in turn, plays a card from his hand to capture one of the exposed cards, putting the two cards face down beside him like cards won in tricks; if he cannot capture any card, he must put whichever of his cards he chooses face up on the table with the rest of the pool. It is stated that a card is captured by a 'higher' card, but unfortunately this term is not defined; the case in which a player cannot capture any card, and has therefore to play a card to the table, is vaguely expressed by saying that he has only cards 'lower' than those on the table. Probably we should interpret the term 'higher' as meaning that a card can capture another card if it would beat the other card if the latter had been led to a trick in the usual type of game: that would mean that a trump can be captured only by a higher trump, a Moor by another Moor or by a higher trump, a suit card either by a higher card of the same suit or by a trump, and the Matto by nothing, although not itself capturing anything; there is unlikely to be any restriction on a player's capturing a suit card with a trump even though he has another card of that suit in his hand. When each player has played three times, and so has no more cards in his hand, the dealer gives out three more cards to each player, and play proceeds as before; each time that the players have no more cards left, the dealer again deals three to each. This is said to continue until the pack is exhausted; the cards remaining on the table at the end of play belong to the player who last captured a card. It is not explained what happens to the last two cards in the pack; since the game may be played by three people, they are probably dealt to the table after the last distribution of cards, but it may be that they are set aside and go to nobody. There is no score for last trick, but, at the end of play, each player reckons the points on his cards and on *cricche* and sequences that can be made with them, and the player with the highest number of points wins.

Partita continued to be played well into the nineteenth century. In 1841 Dr Tommaso Verardini published anonymously in Bologna an account of the game as then played, entitled *Il Tarocco ossia Giuoco della Partita*; a second edition appeared in 1872. Verardini obviously knew Pisarri's book, since he occasionally repeats a phrase from it; but his book is far from being (like so many card-game books) a piece of plagiarism, and he evidently knew the game well. It had hardly changed in the course of a century.

Partita in the nineteenth century

All is as in the eighteenth-century form, with the following exceptions. There is no longer any doubt about the legality of the utterance '*Come vuole*' by the player to the dealer's right during the process, after the first round of the deal, of deciding whether to go *a monte*. If a player declares five sequences during the first trick, his side is awarded 40 chips instead of 30, if he declares six sequences, they are awarded 80 chips instead of 40: this is a reversion to the seventeenth-century practice. Similarly, if a player declares four *cricche* during the first trick, his side is awarded 40 chips, if five *cricche*, 80 chips; this is also a reversion to the seventeenth-century rule. If in any round one side gives a *marcio* to their opponents; i.e. wins all the tricks, then their score for cards and for last trick is doubled. Since the points on cards (including last trick) amount to 77, and there are 846 points for all possible *cricche* and sequences, this means that they make exactly 1,000 points, plus any they may have made for declarations during the first trick. The bonuses in chips for winning with 500 points or more are the same; in addition, if the winning side has 300 points but less than 400, they gain a bonus of 12 chips (plus the 12 or more for their point score), and, if they have 400 points but less than 500, they gain a bonus of 16 chips.

The phrases (*giuochi*) used to give instruction or information have changed somewhat, and have become even more numerous. I give here only the principal ones; the rest will be found in the Appendix to this chapter (pp. 335-7). Among the directives that may be given to one's partner when he is about to lead are:

Sminchi or *Il bello* – As before.

Tiri un trionfetto – Like *Tiri de' trionfetti* before.

Tiri un trionfo – Lead your second highest trump.

Giuochi alla lunga – Lead your longest suit.

Giuochi alla corta – Lead your shortest suit.

Giuochi le sue – As before.

The following are used when one's partner is about to lead for the purpose of giving him information only:

Buone – I have three or four Kings.

Qualche volta – I have two Kings.

Una buona – I have only one King.

Cattive – I have no Kings.

La servo – I have two high trumps.

La posso servire – I have the leading trump and one other high one.

Unicamente or *Per poco* or *Perchè lo sappia* or *Non sarò capotto* or *Prenderò una volta* – I have the *Angelo* but very few other trumps.

Per un flichetto or *Per un piccolo* – I have the *Angelo*.

Per un trionfo – I have the *Mondo*.

The following are among the phrases used when playing a card to a trick to give information to one's partner:

Batto – (Said only when the trick is in trumps) I have the leading trump.

Qui batto – (Said when the trick is in a plain suit) I have the leading card of this suit.

Striccando – As before.

Indietro – (Said only when the trick is in trumps) I have the second highest trump not yet played.

Volo – As before.

Sono in qualche luogo – As before, but said only when the trick is in trumps.

Stricco in niente – (Said only when trumps are played) I have a small trump and the Matto.

In niente – (Said only when trumps are played) I have the Matto but no more trumps.

The principal phrases used when playing a card to give a directive to one's partner are the following:

Vada giuocando – When you get the lead, lead a plain suit not yet played.

Giuochi nuovi – Lead that one suit that has not yet been played.

Giuochi le sue – Lead the King of the sequence you announced.

Ha veduto le mie – Lead the suit of the sequence I announced.

Torni lí – Lead the suit of the preceding trick.

Torni là – Lead the suit of the last trick but one.

Giuochi pure – Keep leading that suit in which the opponents wish to save a card.

Li faccia andare – Lead a suit in which the opponents are void.

In casa – As before.

Faccia a me – Do not play your highest card to this trick.

Vi metti il bello – Play your highest trump to this trick.

Copra appena – Like *Copra solamente* before.

Verardini also allows that, when both the opponents of the dealer have said *A monte*, the dealer's partner may give him information by means of one of the following phrases:

Sono cattive or *Cinque cartaccie* – I have nothing at all.

Vada avanti or *Le dia bene* – I have almost nothing.

Si regoli dalle sue – I have some moderate cards.

Due, uno dei quali rifiuta – I have two trumps, one of them higher than the 15. (Each of the *Mondo*, *Sole*, *Luna* and 16 or *Stella* was called a *trionfo che rifiuta*; a low trump was called a *flichetto*.)

Un trionfetto e cattivo or *Una cartellina con un trionfetto* – I have a King and a low trump.

Una goccia – I have the Matto.

Una goccietta – I have the *Mondo* and no other trump.

Una piccola goccia – I have the Bagattino.

Una regola – I have two *carte da cinque*, or the *Angelo* and another high trump.

Una regolina – I have two Kings and a low trump.

Due trionfetti – I have two low trumps.

Verardini also lists certain phrases which, though in use amongst some, he regards as unlawful.

Partita probably died out around the turn of the century, having become excessively complicated, even by the standards of the Bolognese form of Tarocchi. But, in the form of Ottocento and the other games, Tarocchi continues to be played in Bologna with great enthusiasm, and Bologna is one of the places where Tarot is still vigorously alive. The particular form of the game which that city has contributed is surely one of the most skilled and subtle of all.

At the beginning of this chapter, we discussed the problematic date of origin of the Bolognese game under the assumption that the use of a shortened pack was one of its essential features. But reflection on the rules of the game shows that this is not necessarily so. If the game were to be played with a full 78-card pack, it would be possible to make the rules governing sequences in suits more closely analogous to that governing a *grande*. Without *contatori*, a sequence in Swords or Batons would then consist of the King, at least two of the next three court cards, and then any cards in unbroken sequence 10, 9, 8, … down to Ace; and a sequence in Cups or Coins of the King, at least two of the next three court cards, and then any cards in unbroken sequence Ace, 2, 3, … down to 10. If there had been such a game, perhaps the first effect of shortening the pack would have been to prevent a sequence in Cups or Coins from continuing beyond the Ace; later, the same requirements for a sequence might have been transferred to the suits of Swords and Batons. If this were in fact the historical development, then the shortening of the pack must actually have brought about a simplification of the game. I am not definitely advancing this hypothesis: the sixteenth-century origins of the game are hidden from us; but it is a possibility that cannot be dismissed out of hand.

Appendix: Other Giuochi

Among phrases to be used when one's partner is about to lead to a trick, Pisarri cites the following as not often used or of dubious legality:

Vadi giocando or *Minci, minci* – Lead a suit that has not yet been played.

Giochi di quelle (Play those) – Lead, not the suit that has just been played, but the one played a little earlier.

Giochi sempre delle buone (Keep on playing good ones) – Lead court cards; I have the Kings.

Giochi sempre delle cattive (Keep on playing bad ones) – I do not have a single King; lead numeral cards.

He gives the following as used by some, but as to be absolutely prohibited:

La posso servire per dei piccoli (I can help you by means of little ones) – I have the two leading trumps.

Vadi giocando le sue (Go ahead with playing your own) – Lead the lowest card of a suit sequence you have announced.

Mi faccia andare (Make me go) – Lead the suit in which I am void and can trump.

Among phrases to be used when playing a card to the table, Pisarri cites also the following:

Me ne restano (Some remain to me) – I have three more cards of the suit being played, or (when trumps are being played) three more trumps.

Particina – (When the trick is in trumps) I have four more trumps.

Parte giusta – (When the trick is in trumps) I have five more trumps.

Piú della parte – (When the trick is in trumps) I have six more trumps.

Sfondo (I break) – (When the trick is in a plain suit) I have four more cards of this suit; (when the trick is in trumps) I have seven more trumps.

Quanto se ne può avere (How many more of these can be had) – (When the trick is in trumps) I have eight more trumps.

Ne giochi sempre di queste (Keep on playing these) – Lead this suit when you get the lead.

Qui butto via (Here I am throwing away) – I have no high card in this suit.

Faccia a me (Do to me) or *A me* (To me) – Do not play your highest card, or keep back your high trumps; I have a card we need to save.

He lists the following phrases as unlawful:

Batto forte (I strike hard) – I have the two highest cards of the suit, or (when trumps are being played) the two highest trumps.

Batto fortissimo (I strike very hard) – I have the three highest cards of this suit, or (when trumps are played) the three highest trumps.

Indietro forte (Hard back) – I have the two cards immediately below the highest in this suit, or in trumps.

Indietro fortissimo (Very hard back) – I have the three cards immediately below the highest in this suit, or in trumps.

Stricco in niente – (When trumps are played) I have one small trump left.

Pisarri adds a number of phrases which, he says, are much in use during the process of deciding whether to go *a monte*, to inform one's partner what one has in the first five cards dealt. He objects to the practice, and even more to that of actually showing one's partner one's five cards. The phrases are:

Ho la regola (I have the rule) – I have three good trumps, or two good trumps and a King, the Bagattino or the Matto.

Ho la regolina (I have the little rule) – I have one *carta da cinque* (King or *tarocco*) and two small trumps.

Ho li bugiardi (I have the liars) – I have four trumps.

Ho l'Arlia – I have two Kings.

Ho due romiti (I have two hermits) – I have the Kings of Cups and of Coins. (These two Kings are shown as having beards, and so are called 'hermits'.)

Ho due pellegrini (I have two pilgrims) – I have the Kings of Swords and Batons. (These two Kings are shown as clean-shaven.)

Ho un romito – I have the King of Cups or of Coins.

Ho un pellegrino – I have the King of Swords or of Batons.

Ho tre trionfetti – I have three low trumps.

Ho una goccia (I have a drop) – I have one *carta da cinque*.

Ho un trionfo che rifiuta con un piccolo – I have one of the high trumps and one low one.

Ho due trionfi con una stanella – I have two trumps and a Queen.

Verardini cites also the following directives to a partner about to lead:

Se è il suo caso buttarne – I have good trumps but no Kings; if you have Kings, lead low trumps.

Sarebbe al mio caso – I have Kings but poor trumps; lead a plain suit.

Se fossero belli – If you have the *Mondo* or two high trumps, lead your highest trump.

Se fossero molti – If you have at least seven trumps, lead your highest.

Se non se ne serve – If you do not have a King or any other good lead, lead your highest trump.

Se ne ha delle sue – If you have any Kings, lead one.

He further cites the following two informative phrases to be used when your partner is about to lead:

Non mi conti – I have poor trumps and no Kings.

Il buttarne non mi dà fastidio – I have at least six trumps.

There are many phrases to be used when playing a card. The following are informative:

Anche una buona – (When a suit is played) I have a court card, but not the leading one.

Anche una buonina – I have the Ace of the suit.

Una cattiva – I have just one low card of this suit.

Restano – I have three more cards of this suit, or three more trumps.

Disfo la mano – I have four more cards of the suit, or four more trumps.

Anche la mano – I have five more cards of the suit, or five more trumps.

Piú della mano – (When a suit is played) I have six more cards of this suit.

Resta la parte – (When trumps are played) I have six more trumps.

Piú della parte – I have seven more trumps.

Molti – I have eight more trumps.

Sfondo – I have nine trumps.

Qui sopra – I have the trump immediately above the one I am playing.

Qui di sotto – I have the trump immediately below the one I am playing.

Uno – I have just one more trump, not the leading one.

Quasi volo – I have the leading trump and one or two low ones.

Sono in un buco – I have the *Luna*.

Sono in un piccolo buco – I have the 16.

The following further directives may be given to one's partner while one plays a card:

Se ne ha delle sue – When you get the lead, lead a King if you have one.

Seguiti – Win the trick if you can and lead the same suit.

Questo è il suo giuoco – Lead this suit whenever you get the lead.

Qui vanno – Lead a low card in this suit to force the opponents' trumps.

Da principio – Lead that suit, other than trumps, which was the first to be played.

Vi metti quello che ha – Play your highest card of this suit.

Qui butto via – As before.

Per me non istia – I have the Matto.

Sarebbe al mio caso – Play out your trumps as soon as possible, because all my cards are winners.

Vi pensa lei or *Si faccia del bene* – I am unable to make a break in the opponents' *grande*; I leave this to you.

Tutto è buono – Do not play your Matto, but capture this trump, if you are able to.

Sforzi – Cover the opponent's high trump with a higher one.

Non v'è rimedio – I have to play this card, but do not want to lose it; save it if you can.

Non salvo mai niente – Throw a King on this trick if you can.

Verso di me – Play the cards you are afraid of losing.

Se ne faccia – Lead Kings and other certain winners.

Prenderò – If you can, win each trick to which the opponents play high.

Lasci fare a questa – Play low.

Badi qui – Keep back the King and court cards of this suit.

Qui vi bado io – I have good cards in this suit.

Sa ove deve badare – Keep back your court cards in the suit sequence announced by the opponents.

Mai passate – If you have the King of any suit, play it the first time that suit is played.

Quella buona – Play the good card you have told me that you have.

Quell'una – Lead the single card of a suit you have told me that you have.

Quella cattiva – Lead the low card of a suit which you have told me that you have.

Quella bonina – Lead the Ace you have told me you have.

Non se ne piú giuocato – Lead that suit that has been played only once.

Se è mia non s'incomodi or *Tenghi coperto* – (Said when leading a high trump) If the opponent does not beat this card, do not beat it either.

La copra – Win the trick.

Quello che sta bene or *Quando non v'è interesse* – (Said when leading a high trump) Win the trick if the opponent plays one of the four trumps below the *Angelo*, or throws any good card, otherwise not.

È tempo di partire – Play the *Mondo* or other high card of the *grande* as soon as you safely can.

Sa dove ha da venire – As soon as that suit is led in which I have the leading card, throw a card you are afraid of losing.

Quello che non fa per lei – Lead the card you least mind losing.

Finally, Verardini lists a number of phrases he considers unlawful, as follows:

La posso servire per dei piccoli – As before.

Va giuocando le sue – As before.

Mi faccia andare – As before.

Giuochi sempre buone – I have all four Kings; lead court cards.

Batto forte – I have the three leading trumps. (The meaning has changed from 'two' to 'three' since Pisarri's time.)

Batto fortissimo – I have the four leading trumps.

Batto indietro – I have the two leading trumps.

Indietro forte – I have the second and third highest trumps.

La Bugia – I have four small trumps. (This and the following phrases were probably used to guide the dealer in deciding whether to go *a monte*.)

Ho l'Arlia – I have the 16.

Ho un romito – As before.

Ho un pellegrino – As before.

Tre trionfi – I have three good trumps.

Per dei trionfi – I have two or three of the four cards below the *Angelo*.

Per dei flichetti – I have several low trumps.

Un flichetto ed una sottanella – I have a low trump and a Queen.

Quattro flichetti – I have four low trumps.

Una goccia con un trionfo or *Una cartellina con un trionfo* – I have a King and one of the trumps above the 15.

Ne ho di questa roba – I have a large number of small trumps. (This was presumably used in play.)

Due che rifiutano – I have two trumps higher than the 15.

It is surprising that, when so large a number of these phrases had come to be permitted, restraint was not cast aside altogether, and partners allowed to give each other what information or instructions they pleased; but there was evidently always a distinction felt between what was and what was not permissible.

An oddity not worthy of mention in the main text is the practice, reprobated by Verardini, of announcing a sequence of Moors out of turn, even before the dealer had discarded; as he remarks, this could on occasion affect the discard. Even in this the conservatism of Bolognese players is manifest; for Pisarri also mentions the practice, though only in his catalogue of penalties for revokes, misdeals, etc.; he thought it should be allowed when three Moors, but not when four, were announced.

CHAPTER 17

Minchiate

The game of Minchiate is played with a very special kind of pack. Unlike other distinctive forms of Tarot pack, such as the Bolognese and Sicilian ones, used for special versions of the game, it did not evolve gradually out of the standard 78-card pack in the same way that the variant games evolved from the main stem: it was quite deliberately invented in order to play a new type of game. The Minchiate pack differs from all other forms of Tarot pack in having forty trump cards. With the Matto and the usual fifty-six suit cards, this makes a very large pack of ninety-seven cards; not, however, the largest pack ever used for Tarot games, for, as we saw, one containing as many as 103 cards was at one time used in Munich.

The Minchiate pack was invented in Florence. There is no evidence of its having existed in the fifteenth century: the earliest reference to it known to me is in the dialogue by Pietro Aretino (1492-1556) called *Le Carte Parlanti*, first published in 1543 and sometimes referred to as Part 3 of his *Ragionamenti*, of which the first two parts are highly pornographic. The invention of the pack should therefore be dated to the first half of the sixteenth century. Since in Aretino's dialogue, which is between a cardmaker and his cards, Minchiate cards figure as something quite well known, we can safely assume them to have been invented by the 1530s, but in all probability not before that decade. The number of trumps is increased to 40 by the addition of twenty new subjects: the missing cardinal virtue, Prudence, the three theological virtues, Faith, Hope and Charity, the four elements, Fire, Air, Earth and Water, and the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Since the ordinary Tarocco pack contains 21 trumps, it would appear necessary to add only 19 new ones to obtain the desired number of 40: but, while all the other standard subjects of the Tarocco trumps are retained, there are three cards, numbered IV, III and II, occupying the place in the sequence usually occupied by the four Papal and Imperial ones (Pope, Popess, Emperor and Empress), namely immediately above the Bagatto. The IV, III and II of the Minchiate pack are often described, respectively, as being the Eastern Emperor, the Western Emperor and the Grand Duke. At any rate the Pope and his spurious consort have disappeared. This is no doubt a tiny indication of the altered spirit of the age. In 1534 Alessandro Farnese assumed the Papal tiara as Paul III, the first of the Counter-Reformation Popes and the convenor in 1545 of the Council of Trent. What passed without offence in the ribald era of the Renaissance was no longer so readily acceptable. From the Leber Collection pack, from Aretino's dialogue and from many poems we know that the Pope and Popess continued to figure in the 78-card Tarocco pack; their omission from the Minchiate pack, however, was the first instance of a piece of tact or caution that was often repeated elsewhere, and it is probable that by the late seventeenth century they had ceased to adorn playing cards anywhere save in France, the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland and, of course, Bologna. Perhaps it was more a matter of proximity to Rome, for in Rome itself and throughout the Papal States (except in Bologna) it was Minchiate that, among the games of the Tarot family, became pre-eminently popular.

It is, indeed, true that the first five trumps, from I to V, of the Minchiate pack were collectively known as *Papi* (Popes), despite the absence of the Pope from the trump subjects, the I representing the Bagatto and the V *Amore* (Love). Their being known as *Papi* is not easily explained. It recalls the use of the same term for the Papal and Imperial cards of the Tarocchino pack before 1725; possibly the term was in more general use and was inappropriately transferred to the Minchiate trumps. In any case, it does not seem to have been adopted until the seventeenth century: it is not used by Aretino, nor by the anonymous author of a *tarocchi appropriati* poem, *I Germini sopra Quaranta Meritrice della Città di Fiorenza*, published in Florence, 1553, in which each of the forty trump cards is associated with a named Florentine courtesan. Nor did the pack, or the game, originally bear the name *Minchiate*, but, rather, that of *Germini*, as in the title of the poem and in Aretino's dialogue. *Germini* is obiously a corruption of *Gemini* (the Twins), which represents the subject of trump XXXV in the Minchiate pack, the highest of those showing signs of the Zodiac. The name *Minchiate* doubtless has a connection with the verb *sminchiare* as used by Tarocchino players to mean 'to play a high trump':[1] it had been introduced as a name of the game by the end of the sixteenth century, for, in the form *Menchiatte*, both it and the older name *Germini* appear in John Florio's Italian/English dictionary, *A Worlde of Wordes*, published in London in 1598. When used as the name of the game, the word *Minchiate* is treated as a plural feminine noun; but in some parts of Italy, it had, as a verb in the second person plural, an obscene meaning, as it still does today, though it cannot have had such a meaning in Florence or Rome (at least before the twentieth century), in view of the many books in whose title it figured. Among regions of Italy where the word did have an obscene connotation were Sicily and Liguria; hence in Sicily the game was known instead as *Gallerini* and in Liguria as *Ganellini*. I do not know the etymology of these names; in one source the trump I is on one occasion spoken of as *il Ganellino*.[2]

The customary identification of the trump subjects in the Minchiate pack is due to Romain Merlin in his *Origine des cartes à jouer* (Paris, 1869). In the Minchiate pack, all but the top five trump cards bear Roman numerals, from I to XXXV; and the necessity for so late a writer to identify the subjects arises from the fact that neither in any description of the game that we have nor in literary references is it usual to allude to any but a very few of the numbered trumps save by their numbers. Most of the identifications are quite obvious, and could not be quarrelled with; though I know no literary authority for it, this is true of Merlin's identification of the IV as the Eastern Emperor and the III as the Western Emperor. It is not true, however, of his designation of the II as the Grand Duke. The Republic of Florence was converted into the Grand Duchy of Tuscany only in 1569, whereas, as we have seen, the Minchiate pack was certainly in existence by 1543. The II of the Minchiate trumps shows a crowned, seated and, as was remarked by Sylvia Mann, rather effeminate figure holding an orb and sceptre. Antonio Malatesti, in his poem about the Minchiate pack published in 1683, says of it that it is a Pope by name and a King in appearance; obviously there was not then any traditional identification of it. The second stanza of *I Germini sopra Quaranta Meritrice* is devoted to la Lucia, and begins *'De' Germini m'han fatta la regina'* ('They have made me the Queen of the Germini'). There seems no definite intention underlying the design of the card, or, if there was, it was soon lost. The figure is royal, but its sex is indeterminate; it is a King or a Queen, but we may more conveniently refer to it as the Grand Duke, as long as we remember that it cannot really be that. All that it essentially is is the trump II, the *Papa due*.

The top five unnumbered trumps are called collectively *Arie*, and are the familiar top five trumps of the ordinary Tarocco pack; in ascending order they are the *Stella* (Star), *Luna* (Moon), *Sole* (Sun), *Mondo* (World) and *Trombe* (Trumpets). The *Trombe* is the *Angelo* of other packs, and shows an angel blowing a double trumpet and hovering over a city; it usually bears the inscription 'FAMA VOLA', as sometimes does the Chariot (no. X) also. The twenty cards foreign to the normal Tarocco pack are inserted *en bloc* below the top five cards and above the fifteen cards bearing more familiar subjects: first the four additional virtues, numbered XVI to XIX, then the four elements, numbered XX to

---

[1] The verb was also occasionally used in this sense by Minchiate players; see *Regole Generali del Giuoco delle Minchiate*, Florence, 1781 (and later editions), ch. XIII, p. 28.

[2] *Il Gioco delle Minchiate: Capitolo*, Leghorn, 1752, p. 14.

XXIII, and finally the twelve signs of the Zodiac, numbered XXIV to XXXV. Fire (XX) is represented by a leopard standing in front of a blazing flame, Water (XXI) by a sailing ship upon the sea, Earth (XXII) by a scene with a bridge over a stream, a tree in the middle distance and buildings in the background, and Air (XXIII) by an expanse of sky with clouds, birds and stars, and, on the ground beneath, some sort of beast. The cards from the XXXIII (Leo) up to the *Trombe* inclusive all have red backgrounds, and are known collectively as *rossi*. Trump I is obviously the Bagatto of other packs, but is never so called, being known simply as *l'Uno*, *il Papa uno* or, occasionally, *il Papino*. Trumps II to IV consist, as already noted, of the 'Grand Duke', the Western Emperor and the Eastern Emperor. Trumps V to XV comprise the remaining standard subjects of the Tarocco trumps; few require special notice. The Chariot (X) sometimes bears the inscription 'VIVA VIVA'. The *Gobbo* or Hunchback (XI), who appears in the Tarot de Marseille as the Hermit, here figures more recognisably in his original role of Time, and is sometimes referred to as *il Tempo*: the card shows an aged man on crutches, with a stag seated on the ground behind him and, above his head, an hour-glass transfixed by an arrow. The Hanged Man (XII) shows the usual figure suspended by one foot, who is, however, readily identifiable as Judas from the money-bags he clutches in each hand. The XV, which corresponds to the Tower of other packs (*la Maison Dieu* in the Tarot de Marseille), is called *la Casa del Diavolo* (the House of the Devil), and this accords with its design: from the door of the usual tower, which is being struck by lightning and from which masonry is falling, emerges the Devil to lay hold of a naked woman by the hair and pull her back into Hell.

In the following detailed list of the Minchiate trumps, Italian names (other than *Bagatto*) are given only when they are actually known from some source as applied to Minchiate cards.

I – *Papa uno* (Bagatto)
II – *Papa due* (the 'Grand Duke')
III – *Papa tre* (the Western Emperor)
IV – *Papa quattro* (the Eastern Emperor)
V – *Papa cinque* (Love)
VI – Temperance
VII – Fortitude
VIII – Justice
IX – Wheel of Fortune
X – Chariot
XI – *il Gobbo* (the Hunchback) or *il Tempo* (Time)
XII – *l'Impiccato* (the Hanged Man)
XIII – Death
XIV – *il Diavolo* or *il Demonio* (the Devil)
XV – *la Casa del Diavolo* (the House of the Devil)
XVI – Hope
XVII – Prudence
XVIII – Faith
XIX – Charity
XX – Fire
XXI – Water
XXII – Earth
XXIII – Air
XXIV – Libra (the Scales)
XXV – Virgo (the Virgin)
XXVI – Scorpio (the Scorpion)
XXVII – Aries (the Ram)
XXVIII – Capricornus (Capricorn or the Goat)
XXIX – Sagittarius (the Archer), also called Chiron
XXX – Cancer (the Crab)
XXXI – Pisces (the Fishes)
XXXII – Aquarius (the Water-Carrier)
XXXIII – Leo (the Lion)
XXXIV – Taurus (the Bull)
XXXV – Gemini (the Twins)
(XXXVI) – *la Stella* (the Star)
(XXXVII) – *la Luna* (the Moon)
(XXXVIII) – *il Sole* (the Sun)
(XXXIX) – *il Mondo* (the World)
(XL) – *le Trombe* (the Trumpets)

Although the top five cards, the *Arie*, are unnumbered, they are sometimes referred to by number both in literary references and in descriptions of the game.

There are also certain peculiarities in the design of the suit cards of the Minchiate pack. The Swords are straight, and, in the suits of Cups and Coins, though not in those of Swords and Batons, the lowest court card is female and is called *Fantina* or *Fantiglia*. Since the Batons are of the usual smooth Italian type and the Aces have no dragons on them, it would be somewhat misleading to say that the Minchiate pack employed the Portuguese version of the Latin suit-system; as we have seen, the Portuguese system resulted from the adoption of what were originally permissible variations within the Italian one. But by the sixteenth century, the use of straight Swords had become very rare in Italy, and we may therefore regard the Minchiate pack as exemplifying a hybrid Italo-Portuguese form. The Kings are all seated, and those of Swords and Batons wear short tunics, while those of Cups and Coins wear long robes; the Queens of Swords and Batons are seated, while those of Cups and Coins are standing. But the most remarkable feature is the representation of those court cards which continue to be called *Cavalli*. In Swords and Batons the usual mounted knights have become centaurs; in Cups and Coins they have lost even this much of an equestrian character, and are half-human monsters, in Cups half-dragon, in Coins half-lion. The centaurs at least have some precedent. The sheets in the Rosenwald Collection (no. (22) of Chapter 4) show what is unquestionably a Tarocco pack, but one that has many Minchiate characteristics. The designs of the *Gobbo* and the Hanged Man resemble those of the Minchiate pack: though the *Gobbo* lacks the stag and the hour-glass, he is on crutches in a very similar posture, and the Hanged Man grasps the same money-bags. Although the Swords are curved, the Kings of Swords and Batons wear short tunics, and those of Cups and Coins long robes, exactly like their Minchiate counterparts; and, as in the Minchiate pack, in Swords and Batons the lowest court cards are male, in Cups and Coins female. All four *Cavalli* in the Rosenwald pack are centaurs. Very probably the Rosenwald pack represents the standard Florentine pattern for the Tarocco pack, from which many features were borrowed when the Minchiate pack was first devised.

What was probably the original standard pattern for the Minchiate pack lasted until the 1890s, with hardly any change; several seventeenth-century examples survive. A second pattern was introduced in the middle of the eighteenth century; it did not achieve the same popularity as its older rival, but survived it by a few decades. There is no sign that the game suffered the same decline in popularity as that which affected, in the later seventeenth century, the parent game played with the 78-card pack: it appears to have enjoyed a steady popularity that reached its zenith in the eighteenth century. In Part 1 of *La Sfinge*, published in 1640, a collection of riddles in verse by the Florentine poet Antonio Malatesti (1610-1672), the answer to riddle 20 is '*l'Uno de' Germini*' – the trump I of the *Germini* pack; and the answer to riddle 71 in Part 2 (published in 1643) is '*il giuoco delle Minchiate*', the game of Minchiate. Parts 1 and 2 were republished in 1683 together with a posthumous Part 3, of which the third section was entitled 'Quadernari delle Minchiate', consisting of sixty-six quatrains each devoted to one of the principal cards of the Minchiate pack. Malatesti's friend, the Florentine painter and poet Lorenzo Lippi (1606-1665), composed a long poem, *Il Malmantile Racquistato*, of which two stanzas (61 and 62 of the 8th canto) related to Minchiate. The first edition of this poem appeared posthumously in 1676, under the anagrammatic pseudonym Perlone Zipoli, with a commentary by his friend Paolo Minucci, using the pseudonym Puccio Lamoni: this commentary contains the first detailed description of the game of Minchiate. Minucci's notes were expanded by Biscioni, with further remarks on Minchiate games, for a new edition of 1731. These poems not only give useful detailed information, but serve to show that, at least in Florence, the game continued to be well known throughout the seventeenth century. Minucci states expressly that it is quite well known, but adds that it is not much played outside Tuscany, or at any rate is played elsewhere under different rules; later he mentions Liguria specifically as a region in which it is played in a considerably different manner.

We know from other sources that in 1663 it was introduced into Sicily, probably from Rome, but that it died out there in the course of the eighteenth century. In that century, however, we have much testimony as to its popularity in Rome. Joseph Baretti, in his *Account of the Manners and Customs of Italy* (London, 1768), speaks of both Tarocco and Minchiate, the former as played in Piedmont and Lombardy, the latter 'all over Tuscany and the Pope's dominions' (vol. II, ch. 33, pp. 219-21). In de La Lande's *Voyage d'un François en Italie fait dans les années 1765 et 1766* (Venice, 1769), a travel-book in eight volumes, Minchiate is spoken of at length (vol. V, pp. 157-60) as a game much played in Italy: '*tout le monde l'aime à Rome*' ('everybody in Rome is fond of it'). There were many eighteenth-century accounts of the game. The first, after Minucci, was Luigi Bernardi's *Regole Generali del nobilissimo gioco delle Minchiate*, published in Rome in 1728 and reissued there in 1742 and 1773. F.S. Brunetti's *Giuochi delle Minchiate, Ombre, Scacchi ed altri d'ingegno*, in which the rules of the games are interlarded with some tiresome allegorical matter, was also published in Rome, in 1747. An anonymous account in *terza rima, Il Giuoco delle Minchiate: Capitolo*, appeared in Leghorn in 1752, and was republished in Florence in 1827. Minchiate was included in Raffaelle Bisteghi's card-game book, *Il Giuoco Pratico*, which also contained the first printed account of Tarocchino, published in Bologna in 1753 and reissued there in 1754, 1760, 1774, 1785 and 1820, and in Milan in 1819. The first account to be published in Florence was another anonymous one in *terza rima*, the *Regole Generali delle Minchiate* of 1777; this was followed in 1781 by the prose account *Regole Generali del Giuoco delle Minchiate* (*RGGM*), reprinted in 1790, 1807, 1820 (with a substantial addition) and 1852. From all this it is evident that the game was highly regarded, both in Rome and Florence, throughout the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, as Robert Smith also testified in a letter to the Society of Antiquaries of November 1803 (published in *Archaeologia*, vol. XV, 1806, pp. 140-4), saying that it was 'held in high esteem among the fashionable circles in Tuscany'. (Smith presented the Society with a Minchiate pack and a copy of the 1781 edition of *RGGM* which are still to be seen at the Society's rooms in Burlington House). The latest work to deal with Minchiate was the *Precetti al Giuocatore in Conversazione* (Milan, 1868); but as this borrowed heavily from *Il Giuoco Pratico*, it cannot be considered good evidence that the game still flourished at that date.

Tarocchino and Minchiate are alike in their histories in that both variant games, probably invented at about the same time, retained their hold upon the affections of card players in their native cities at the time when the 78-card game was fading from general esteem, and survived intact to participate in the widespread enthusiasm for Tarot games which, in the eighteenth century, brought the 78-card pack back to Italy from France. Their histories differ in that, while Tarocchino remained confined to the region of its origin, Minchiate became known in many parts of Italy. Furthermore, while Tarocchino (though no longer so called) still flourishes vigorously in Bologna, Minchiate has long died out. It seems to have survived longer in Genoa than in its native Florence. Sylvia Mann, in *Collecting Playing Cards*, London, 1966, p. 38, remarks that 'The cards have fallen out of use and no Florentine I have met has ever heard of them'; but she might have had more success if she had asked for Minchiate cards in Genoa, though not under that name. In Florence the decline of Minchiate must have begun in the second half of the nineteenth century, and, though packs were still being made there in the 1890s, the game was probably extinct soon after the end of that century; in Rome, no doubt considerably earlier. The card-making firm of Solesio, in Genoa, on the other hand, was still producing Minchiate packs, presumably for local consumption, in the 1920s and 30s; in 1978 Stanley Gibbons sold a Solesio pack with an Italian tax stamp dated 1929, and in the 1930s Mr Martin Drayson of New York imported some Solesio packs for sale to playing-card collectors. We should probably date the final demise of the game at around 1935.

According to Minucci, the game was played in Liguria in a manner differing considerably from that prevalent in Florence. Unfortunately, all the accounts we have come either from Tuscany or from Rome, with the exception of *Il Giuoco Pratico*, which was plainly describing the Florentine/Roman form; there is no hint that the manner of play differed between Rome and Florence, but we have no evidence for that which prevailed in Genoa. It is possible that there are some still living in that city who remember it. One curious oddity is a Minchiate pack made by Solesio and bearing tax stamps dated 1896 and 1913, in the collection of Mr David Temperley. This has, besides the usual ninety-seven cards, what appears to be an additional unnumbered trump. Like the usual unnumbered trumps, it has a red background, and shows a naked female figure, in a running posture and holding something resembling a skipping-rope; her foot is on an arc of a wheel, and it and she are enclosed within a circle which is supported by two male figures rising from the ground. I cannot guess what this design is intended to represent, but it is hard to interpret the card as anything but an additional trump. At present, no other example of a pack containing this additional card is known to me, and the later Solesio packs certainly do not include it; but it is possible that some variant form of the Genoese game demanded an extra *Aria*. In any case, the mode of play of Genoese Minchiate, or, rather, Ganellini, is, and may for ever be, a gap in the history of Tarot games.

Not only did Minchiate spread from Florence to other parts of Italy, to Rome and the Papal

States, to Sicily and to Liguria: it also became known abroad.[3] At least two descriptions of the game were published in German. One such was included in the second edition of *Die Kunst, die Welt erlaubt mitzunehmen in den verschiedenen Arten der Spiele* (Nuremberg, 1769); this was a translation of that given in *Il Giuoco Pratico*. A separate account, which appears to be independent, was published in Dresden in 1798 under the title *Regeln des Minchiatta-Spiels* (*RMS*); this is a very careful description, more explicit than any of the Italian ones and painstaking in its reproduction of the Italian terminology, which, however, it sometimes misspells. It is unlikely, though, that the vogue for Minchiate outside Italy was ever very widespread. One possible remote descendant of the Minchiate pack came to light recently, and provides a curious puzzle. This is a pack made, possibly in the 1930s, by Piatnik of Vienna; examples are in the Piatnik collection, and in those of Miss Sylvia Mann and of Mr David Temperley. The wrapper is entirely in French, and is labelled 'Tarot à 73 cartes'. The 73-card pack consists of the usual thirty-two suit cards of an Austrian 54-card French-suited Tarock pack, but with 40 trump cards together with the usual Austrian Sküs (Fool). The trumps show rustic scenes of the type usual in Austrian 54-card packs, and are numbered from 1 to 40 in Arabic numerals, half of which are in red and half in black: specifically, numbers 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 are in red, and the rest in black. Apart from Minchiate packs, this is the only Tarot pack containing forty trumps; and I have found no other trace of a game played with 73 cards. It is conceivable that it represents some descendant of Minchiate that has been subject to influence from the games played with the shortened 54-card Tarot pack, though the significance of the red and black numerals escapes me. It was obviously made for export to some purely French-speaking area. The best guess I can make at the region it was intended for is the Val d'Aosta, a somewhat isolated part of Italy where a highly localised tradition might well survive without being discovered by anyone from outside. Whatever may be the explanation of this apparent freak, it provides another illustration of the gaps that must surely remain in our knowledge of the history of the game of Tarot, however thoroughly we investigate it.

The game of Minchiate is generically similar to that of Tarocchino. In both cases, the principal form is a four-handed game with fixed partnerships. In Minchiate, as in Tarocchino, there are scores for special combinations of cards, both when held in the hand of one player and declared at the beginning of play, and also when contained among the cards won in tricks by a pair of partners; and, as in Tarocchino, these scores swamp the points on individual cards won in tricks. Both games have a bonus for winning the last trick; and neither has any idea of a special bonus for winning it with the trump I. In detail, however, the two games are very different. Not only are the scoring combinations wholly dissimilar, but the selection of counting cards in Minchiate differs radically from that in any other Tarot game: exactly half of the forty trumps are counting cards, of different values, while, of the court cards, only the Kings retain their point-values. There are thus twenty-five counting cards altogether (twenty trumps, four Kings and the Matto), so that the ratio of counting cards to low cards remains much the same as in games with the 78-card pack (25:72 as against 19:59), lower than in Tarocchino (20:42) or in games played with the 54-card pack (19:35). Moreover, unlike in Tarocchino, with one single exception (the XXIX), low cards cannot contribute to the special scoring combinations. The various printed descriptions of the game agree extremely closely, so that, while we can probably not recover the distinct mode of play observed in Liguria, we have a very clear idea how it was played in Florence and Rome from, say, 1675 onwards.

Minchiate with partners

Terminology

Trumps are called *tarocchi*. Counting cards are called *carte di conto*, and trumps which are counting cards *tarocchi nobili*. Trumps which are not counting cards are called *tarocchi ignobili*, and low suit cards are called *cartiglie* or *cartaccie*. The Fool is called *il Matto*: the three highest court cards in each suit are called *Re*, *Regina* and *Cavallo*; the lowest court card in Swords and Batons is called *Fante* and in Cups and Coins *Fantina* or *Fantiglia*. As already mentioned, the five lowest trumps, from I to V, are called *Papi* and the top five trumps *Arie*. Trumps VI to IX or even XII are also sometimes called *Papi*, *Papetti* or *tarocchini*, but these usages are rare, unnecessary and confusing. The XXXI to XXXV are called *sopratrenti*; likewise the XXI to XXIX are sometimes called *sopraventi* and the XI to XIX *sottoventi*. The trumps from XXXIII upwards, particularly the XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV, are called *rossi*, from their red backgrounds. Malatesti gives the name *salamandre* for the XVI to XIX (the four additional virtues), while *RMS* says that they are called *preghe* (in the *Germini sopra Quaranta Meritrice*, they are assigned to four procuresses or *ruffiane*); but these cards have no special significance in the game. The special scoring combinations of cards are called *versicole*, *verzicole* or *verzigole*; the stock of undealt cards is called *la Fola* or *la Folla*. Other special terms will be mentioned as they become relevant.

---

[3] Catherine Perry Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1930, 1966, p. 38, illustrates a Minchiate pack stated to have been made in France. The ground for assigning it to France is presumably the Bourbon fleur-de-lys watermark, but this is poor evidence, such a watermark being quite common outside France. Chiari of Florence made a pack identical to the one illustrated by Hargrave, which is almost certainly his. There is thus no reason for supposing Minchiate to have been known in France.

Rank and values of the cards

The highest trumps are the five *Arie*, which are, in descending order, the *Trombe*, the *Mondo*, the *Sole*, the *Luna* and the *Stella*. Below them come the numbered trumps in sequence down from the XXXV to the *Uno* (I). The Matto has no trick-taking power and serves as Excuse. In the suits, the cards rank in their original order, that is to say, in Swords and Batons they rank, in descending order:

King, Queen, Cavallo, Jack (*Fante*), 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, Ace,

and, in Cups and Coins:

King, Queen, Cavallo, Maid (*Fantina*), Ace, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

The counting cards are the four Kings, the Matto, the five *Papi* from I to V, the X, the XIII, the XX, the XXVIII and the eleven highest trumps from the XXX to the *Trombe* inclusive. Their values are as follows:

Each *Aria*	10 points
The *Uno* (I)	5 points
The X	5 points
The XIII	5 points
The XX	5 points
The XXVIII	5 points
Each trump from XXX to XXXV	5 points
The Matto	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each *Papa* from II to V inclusive	3 points

Thus the *Arie* are worth 10 points each, the *Papi* from II to V 3 points each and every other counting card 5 points. In addition, there are 10 points for winning the last trick.

Deal and discard

There are four players, in fixed partnerships of two each, partners facing each other across the table. Four rounds constitute one *girata*, in the course of which each player is dealer once, and it is usual to play a *girata* with each combination of partners. Deal and play are counter-clockwise.

After having shuffled the pack, the dealer presents it to the player on his left to cut. *RMS* says that, before he does so, the dealer looks at the bottom of the pack, and, if the bottom card is a counting card, removes it to the middle of the pack, and repeats this operation until the bottom card is a low card. No Italian source mentions this detail, which is designed to prevent the player who cuts doing so in such a way as to ensure that his partner gets the bottom card when it is a good one.

The player on the dealer's left lifts a section of the pack from the top in the usual way (he must leave at least three cards); but, instead of placing this top section face down on the table, he turns it over so as to expose its bottom card. If this card is a counting card, or, although not a counting card, a trump higher than the XX, he takes it and lays it face up in front of him. If the next card is a counting card or a trump higher than the XX, he takes it in the same way, and continues to take cards until he reaches one that is neither a counting card nor a trump higher than the XX. *RMS* requires him to stop when he has taken thirteen cards (if he should be so lucky), even if the next card is a counting card or a trump higher than the XX; *RGGM*, on the other hand, says expressly that he should not stop, but should continue until he reaches a low card. To take counting cards and *sopraventi* from the pack in this way is called 'to rob' (*rubare*) the pack. The opponents of the dealer score the values in points of all the counting cards which the player on the dealer's left robs.

The player on the dealer's left now puts the remainder of the top section of the pack face down on the table; the dealer places the bottom section on top of it, and deals a round of ten cards to each player, beginning with the player on his right. He then deals a round of eleven cards to each player, in each case exposing the eleventh card. If the card thus exposed is a counting card, the side concerned scores its value.

The stock of undealt cards is called the *Fola*. The dealer counts the *Fola* to make sure he has dealt correctly: it should consist of thirteen cards less any that have been robbed by the player to his left. The dealer now robs the pack in his turn. He turns up the *top* card of the *Fola*: if it is a counting card, or a trump higher than the XX, he takes it, placing it face up on the table in front of him. In this case, he then turns up the next card of the *Fola*, and, if it is a counting card or a trump higher than the XX, takes it in the same way, and continues to do this until he reaches a card that is neither a counting card nor a trump higher than the XX. The dealer's side scores the value of any counting card robbed by the dealer in this way. (It is important that the dealer should turn the top card rather than exposing the bottom card, which will necessarily be a low card.) The dealer now looks through the remaining cards of the *Fola*, and, if there are any counting cards there, he extracts them, and lays them face up on the table in front of him. They belong to him, but his side does *not* score any points for them. To extract counting cards from the *Fola* in this way is called *pigliare*; note that, unlike the case of robbing the pack, the dealer does not extract from the *Fola* trumps above the XX that are not counting cards. The purpose of this rule is to ensure that all the counting cards are in play.

The dealer now hands what remains of the *Fola* to his partner. The partner looks at it, and sorts it into suits: he places the trumps face down in a pile in front of him, but the suit cards, arranged in their different suits, face up beside the trumps; he also announces how many cards of each suit there are in the *Fola*.[4] (He does not announce the number of trumps, but this is deducible by subtraction.) In the meantime, each player picks up his hand, including the exposed card, and, in the case of the dealer and the player on his left, any cards they have robbed from the pack or extracted from the *Fola*. If, by robbing or extracting cards, the dealer or the player on his left has more than twenty-one cards in his hand, he has to discard as many as are needed to reduce it to twenty-one cards. He may not discard a counting card, but he may discard all other cards, including trumps. The dealer and the player on his left place the cards they have discarded face down in front of them on the table.

It will be remembered that, according to *RMS*, the player to the dealer's left may not rob more than thirteen cards. Of course, it will be very seldom that he robs that many; but, if he does, the dealer will have no opportunity to rob or to extract cards: the pack will be exhausted when the deal is completed. According to *RGGM*, on the contrary, the player to the dealer's left may, if he is lucky enough, rob more than thirteen cards. In this case, the dealer will not be able to deal himself a full complement of eleven cards on the second round of the deal. Instead, he deals himself all the remaining cards, exposing the last one, and then waits for the player to his left to make his discard. This player sets thirteen discarded cards face down in front of him, and gives the other cards that he discards, which will necessarily be low cards, to the dealer to make up his hand.

Brunetti remarks that it was formerly the rule that, if the dealer was unable either to rob or to extract any cards from the *Fola*, he had to pay a penalty of 1 *resto* or game point, equivalent to 60 card points; presumably, in the partnership game, his side had to pay the opposing side. However, Brunetti says, the rule was abandoned as being too brutal.

As soon as the dealer and the player to his left have made their discards, the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. The other players do not immediately play to the trick, however: there is first a pause for declarations.

Declarations

As soon as the player to the dealer's right has led the first card, each player in turn, beginning with the one on the dealer's right, announces any of the special combinations of cards, called *versicole*, he has in his hand, and shows them to the other players. There are two kinds of *versicole*, regular and irregular. A regular *versicola* consists of three or more trumps in strict consecutive sequence. Not every trump can form part of a regular *versicola*, but only the *Papi* from I to V and the trumps from the XXVIII up to the *Trombe* inclusive. There are names for various kinds of regular *versicola*, although the distinctions between the different types in no way affect the rules of the game. A *versicola* consisting of three or more *Papi* is of course called a *versicola di Papi*; a *versicola* containing numbered cards from the XXVIII up is called a *versicola di tarocchi*; one containing one or more *Arie* is called a *versicola d'Arie*; one containing the XXX is called a *versicola di trenti*; one starting with the XXXI or XXXII a *versicola di sopratrenti*; and one consisting of the XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV a *versicola di rossi*.

---

[4] *RMS* states various conventions governing the announcement by the dealer's partner or the dealer himself of the numbers of cards in the different suits. The suits containing more cards are mentioned first, e.g. 'Four Cups, three Coins, one Sword, without Batons'. If there are equal numbers of cards in two or more suits, this is expressed by '*per sorte*' ('of each kind'), leaving those suits unnamed. Thus 'Four Coins, two *per sorte*' means 'Four Coins, two Swords, two Batons, two Cups'; 'Four Coins, two *per sorte*, without Batons' means 'Four Coins, two Swords, two Cups, no Batons'; 'Four *per sorte*, two Cups, one Baton' means 'Four Swords, four Coins, two Cups, one Baton'. Swords and Batons can be referred to collectively as *lunghi* (long), and Cups and Coins as *rotondi* (round); *RMS* gives *rosse* (red) in place of *rotondi*, but this is a mistake. Hence 'Three *rotondi*, two *lunghi*' means 'Three Cups, three Coins, two Swords, two Batons'. If there are, respectively, one, two, three and four cards of the different suits, the suits are given, without numerals, in ascending order, according to the number of cards in each: thus 'Cups, Swords, Coins, Batons' means 'One Cup, two Swords, three Coins, four Batons'.

The irregular *versicole* are as follows:

(a) *Uno*, *Trombe* and Matto (called *versicola del Matto*);

(b) *Uno*, XIII and XXVIII (called *versicola del Tredici*);

(c) the X, XX and XXX, or the XX, XXX and *Trombe*, or the X, XX, XXX and *Trombe* (any of which is called a *versicola delle diecine*);

(d) any three, or all four, Kings (a *versicola dei Regi*).

The player who has the Matto cannot use it as a wild card, to substitute for a card missing from a *versicola*; but he can add it on to every *versicola* that he has, save, of course, the *versicola del Matto*, of which it is already an integral part.

With one exception, the value of any *versicola* is simply the sum total of the values of the cards it contains, considered as counting cards, including 5 points for the Matto if it is annexed to the *versicola*. Thus a *versicola* consisting of the *Uno, Papa* II and *Papa* III is worth 11 points, one comprising the X, XX and XXX 15 points, and one made up of the XXXIV, XXXV, *Stella* and *Luna* 30 points. The exception is a *versicola* containing the XXIX, the only non-counting card that can form part of a *versicola*; in such a *versicola*, the XXIX counts 5 points, so that the XXVIII, XXIX, XXX and XXXI together count 20 points. Each side records the values of the *versicola* declared by either partner (see under *Scoring*).

Completion of the Fola

When the declarations are completed, and before play to the first trick is resumed, the dealer and the player to his left turn over the cards they discarded for the other players to see, and pass them to the dealer's partner, who announces which cards each of them has discarded, and then sets the discarded cards, according to their suits, with the cards of the *Fola*; in this way he reconstitutes a full *Fola* of thirteen cards. He then again announces how many cards of each of the plain suits belong to this reconstituted *Fola* (the number of trumps again follows by subtraction). Having done this, he passes the *Fola* to the dealer, who places it face down beside him. At any stage of the game, any player may ask the dealer to remind him how many cards of each suit there are in the *Fola*, and he is bound to answer; the dealer may himself look at the *Fola* at any time. It is also permitted for any player, at any time, to look at the tricks that his side has made.

Play

When the dealer has placed the *Fola* beside him, play to the first trick is resumed, and the hands are played out, under the usual rules, in twenty-one tricks. As usual, it is obligatory to follow suit if one can, including playing a trump if a trump is led, and, when one cannot follow suit, to play a trump if one can.

There is a special rule governing the first trick to be played in any one of the four plain suits. If the player who holds the King of that suit is not the one who led to the trick, and if, before his turn comes to play, another player has played a trump to that trick, he is bound to play his King, regardless of whether he has the Matto or another card of that suit. This rule does not apply when the trick is not the first one to which that suit has been led; nor does it apply when a trump has not yet been played to the trick, even if the player who has the King knows that a later player will play a trump.

Whenever one side captures a counting card from the other side, that counting card is said to 'die' (*morire*). In each such case, the side winning the trick immediately scores the value of that counting card as a bonus.

The Matto serves as Excuse. That is to say, a player who has the Matto may play it at any time, regardless of the obligation to follow suit or to play a trump, save that he may not play it in place of his King in the special case mentioned above. If the opponents win the trick to which he plays it, he takes it back from the centre of the table and places it among the cards won in tricks by his side. If he can, he then gives in exchange for it a low card from among those won in tricks by his side. If his side has not yet won a trick, or has not yet won one containing a low card, he may wait and give a card in exchange at the end of the round. If, at the end of the round, his side has won only counting cards in its tricks, he must give any one of those counting cards of his choice in exchange for the Matto: the counting card he gives is then regarded as dying, so that the opponents score its value as a bonus, as if they had captured it (as well as adding its value to their point-total on cards won in tricks). If the side which had the Matto makes no tricks at all, it must surrender the Matto itself: this is the only case in which the Matto can die. The opponents then score 5 points as a bonus for the death of the Matto, in addition to adding 5 points to their point-total and being able to annex the Matto to every *versicola*. It does not seem to be envisaged that a player will ever lead the Matto to a trick.

RMS mentions a rule otherwise cited only by Brunetti, namely that a player who has no more trumps left in his hand is allowed to 'drop' (*cascare*) his cards: he lays them face up on the table, is not permitted to win another trick, and takes no more part in the play; in each subsequent trick, the player who wins it takes a suitable card from the exposed hand to complete the trick. It is plainly inadvisable to take advantage of this rule if one has a King or the Matto still in one's hand; but, when one has no further chance of winning a trick, it may be helpful to one's partner thus to let him know how matters stand.

Scoring

There are several possibilities of gaining points before the end of the round: for a counting card exposed as the last card dealt to either of the partners; for counting cards robbed from the pack; for *versicole* declared during the first trick; or for causing the deaths of the opponents' counting cards (i.e. capturing them). The points recorded for any of these reasons during the round are always those by which one or other side is ahead of the other, so that, at any stage, one side has a positive score and the other a null score; points gained by the side currently behind the other are subtracted from the score of the leading side. For example, the third player (left of the dealer) robs the III, so his side (side A) marks 3 points. The first player's exposed card in the deal is the XIII, so side A changes its running total to 8 points. Now the dealer robs the XX, so side A reduces its total to 3 points again. The third player declares a *versicola* of the I, II and III (11 points), and side A's score is raised to 14 points; but the dealer declares the XX, XXX and *Trombe* (20 points), so side A's score is deleted and side B scores 6 points. In the play, side A captures the XXVIII, reducing side B's score to 1 point; later, side A captures the *Luna*, wiping out side B's score and marking 9 points.

At the end of the round, each side reckons up its point-total, of which there are five possible constituents. First are the points gained by one of the two sides during the round, as just explained. Secondly, there are 10 points for the side winning the last trick. Thirdly, the side that has won more than 42 cards altogether in the tricks scores as many points as it has cards in excess of 42 (42 being the number of cards the partners had between them at the start of play). Fourthly, each side scores points for all the counting cards it has won in tricks, according to their point-values: the counting cards are counted separately, and do not have to be açcompanied by low cards.[5] Finally, each side scores for each *versicola* contained in the cards it has won in tricks; the side that has the Matto adds it to every *versicola* (save, of course, the *versicola del Matto*).

The winning side is obviously that with the higher point-total, and payment is made in accordance with the difference between the totals of the winning and losing sides. Payment is made in game points called *resti*, one *resto* for every 60 points or part of 60 points: thus if the difference is between 1 and 60 points inclusive, 1 *resto* is paid, if between 61 and 120 points inclusive, 2 *resti* are paid, and so on.

If, however, at any stage during the round one side attains a score of 60 points or more, the other side immediately pays them 1 *resto*, and the 60 points are deducted from their score and, as having already been paid for, do not go towards their final point-total. This may be to their disadvantage. Suppose, e.g., that side A, having robbed several counting cards and declared several *versicole*, attains a score of 63 points during the course of the round. Side B pays 1 *resto* to side A, and side A's score is reduced to 3 points. Later in the round, side B is more fortunate, and finishes up with a point-total 9 points higher than that of A. A has now to pay B 1 *resto*, and the round is in effect a draw. If, however, A had not been paid in the middle of the round, but had been allowed to keep all 63 points, they would have finished with a point-total 51 points higher than that of B, and would have received a (net) payment of 1 *resto*.

RMS states that if one side wins all the tricks, their payment in *resti* for the final score is doubled, although not any *resti* they may have received during the round. This privilege is not mentioned in any of the Italian sources.

The later editions of *RGGM* (1820 and 1852) give the name *girata* to a set of four rounds with the same partners, and the name *girone* to a set of three *girate*, one with each possible combination of partners. The overall winners of a *girata* receive an additional bonus of 3 *resti*.

Terms relating to the play

The object of the play is, of course, to save one's own counting cards, help one's partner save his and capture those of the opponents, and particularly those forming *versicole*. There are certain cards which are of special importance, and are called *carte gelose* (jealous cards). These are: the *Uno*, because it forms part of three different *versicole*; the *Papa* III, because without it one cannot form a *versicola* of *Papi*; the XX, because without it one cannot form a *versicola delle diecine*; the XXX, for the same reason, and because it may also belong to a regular *versicola*; and the *Sole*, without which one cannot form a *versicola* composed entirely of *Arie*. The XIII and the XXVIII may to a lesser degree be considered *carte gelose*. Cards the loss of which will destroy an existing *versicola* (particularly the middle card of a regular *versicola* such as XXXI, XXXII and XXXIII) are also to be treated as *carte gelose*. Except when one is forced to do so, one should never play a *carta gelosa* to a trick one cannot be sure of.

---

[5] It was conventional to arrange the cards, when counting them, in packets (*mazzetti*) of three, with a counting card on top, and two non-counting cards, say a *tarocco ignobile* and a *cartaccia*, underneath: 14 such packets made up 42 cards. This practice had, however, no actual significance for the counting: its purpose was only to facilitate the subsequent shuffling of the pack by preventing all the counting cards from being grouped together.

A player holding the King of a suit in which he suspects, from the discards or the composition of the *Fola*, that one of his opponents is void may, when he obtains the lead, lead another card of that suit. This is called to 'hang' (*impiccare*), or, less frequently, to 'smother' (*affogare*), the King. He should always do this if the suit has not yet been led to a trick and he does not know the player to his left to have a card in that suit, for fear of having to surrender his King under the special rule requiring him to do so when the first trick in that suit is trumped. But, if he has length in the suit – five or six cards – he may also continue to lead cards of that suit in the hope either that his partner will become void in the suit before the player to his left does, and will then, when he eventually does lead the King, be able to overtrump the player to his right, or that he will be able to exhaust both opponents' holdings in the suit, and then, later, will be able to throw the King on a winning trump of his partner. This latter tactic is, of course, in place only when the player with the King has a small number of trumps.

A player may with advantage repeatedly lead a suit in which his partner is void, or will soon become void, so that his partner may win the trick with a *carta gelosa* or other *tarocco nobile*. It is his responsibility, however, to do this only so long as he is sure that there are other cards of that suit still in play, taking into account the number already played, the number in the *Fola*, and the number in his own hand. If he does this, and the player to his right trumps, his partner will know that he can safely overtrump with a *carta gelosa*, since the other opponent will have to follow suit: to lead a card in a plain suit in which the player to one's left has one or more cards is called a *rifitta*, and is always the safest possible lead. If a player has been leading a suit, and comes to the point where there are no cards of that suit left save in his own hand, he must not continue to lead that suit without first making some other lead, which is a signal to his partner that the suit is no longer safe. The only occasion on which this does not apply is when he leads the last card of the suit in his hand, since his partner can be expected to know if it is the last card of the suit in play. A particular case of a *rifitta* is that in which the player knows that the opponent to his left still has a King of the suit, as yet unplayed; it is normally bad play to lead towards one's partner's King.

In general, it is not good play to lead trumps early in the round; but it may be advisable to do this if the two partners hold between them a great many trumps, including most of the high ones. A signal to one's partner that one has the *Trombe* is called a *fumata*, and is made by leading either a *Papa* or a *sopraventi* (a trump from XXI to XXVII). If the whereabouts of the *Trombe* is already known, such a signal is taken as indicating possession of the *Mondo*, or, in general, of the highest *Aria* whose whereabouts is not known. *RMS* states that some players recognise it as a signal that one has the *Trombe* that one plays the X the first time one trumps a trick in a plain suit, but warns that many do not recognise this convention; it also states that, among some, a *fumata* with the XXV, XXVI or XXVII indicates possession of the two highest trumps, or of two *Arie*, and one with the XXI, XXII, XXIII or XXIV possession of the three highest trumps, or of three *Arie*. When a *fumata* is given, the partner, if he has strong trumps, may decide to initiate a *giuoco di giro*, that is, play in which the two partners play out their high trumps with the intention of exhausting their opponents' trumps; in doing this, they may catch an *Aria* belonging to the opponents if one partner leads *sopratrenti* towards the other partner who holds a higher *Aria*, which he holds back until the opponents' *Aria* falls. A signal to commence a *giuoco di giro* is to 'turn' (*girare*) a card to one's partner, that is, to lead the *Uno* or other *carta gelosa*, in the knowledge that he is certain to be able to take the trick; the partner must, of course, play his highest trump.

A *tenuta* consists of playing a trump, to a trick in a plain suit or to a trump trick, that is higher than an important counting card known or believed to be in an opponent's hand, with the intention either of capturing it or at least of preventing the opponent from bringing it home. Thus, with a trump from the VI to the IX one can make a *tenuta* to a *Papa*, with one from the XIV to the XIX a *tenuta* to the XIII, and with a *sopraventi* a *tenuta* to the XX.

The prior history of the game is far from easy to determine. There are two quite separate questions. First, how old are the fundamental rules – the selection of counting cards, their values, the composition of the *versicole* and the procedure of robbing the pack? Secondly, how old is the four-handed form with partners? The literary sources throw little light on the first question. Malatesti's riddle 20, in Part 1 of *La Sfinge* (1640) has, as its answer, '*L'Uno de' Germini*', and he explains this answer by remarking that the *Uno* can form part of two *verzicole*, namely *Uno*, 13 and 28 and *Uno*, Matto and *Trombe*. One might wonder whether a *versicola* of *Papi* was not yet recognised, but Minucci's account of Minchiate in his notes of 1676 to Lippi's *Il Malmantile Racquistato* gives the rules governing counting cards and *versicole* precisely as in the eighteenth-century descriptions of the game. So far as the evidence goes, therefore, the fundamentals of the game seem to have been the same in the seventeenth century as in the eighteenth. Minucci's account also explains the procedure of robbing the pack, just as in the eighteenth-century form; and, indeed, Lippi's stanza 61 of his 8th Canto concerns the fury of a player who is penalised for having forgotten to discard after he had robbed the pack.

The sixteenth-century sources unfortunately give no clue, one way or the other, to the play of the game. Since the pack itself was obviously a deliberate creation, the game must be assumed to have been one too, and on this ground we might suppose that its fundamental rules were the same from the start. It is, however, impossible not to be struck by the unnatural character of those rules. That the lowest and the highest trumps should be counting cards is understandable: but why also the X, the XIII, the XX and the XXVIII? That the *Uno*, *Trombe* and Matto should form a *versicola* is an obvious echo of games with the 78-card pack: but why the *Uno*, XIII and XXVIII? Obviously, to ensure that every counting card can be a member of a *versicola*; but that brings us back to the question why the XIII and XXVIII were selected as counting cards. And why should the XXIX, alone of all non-counting cards, be able to form part of a *versicola*? The purpose of these questions is not to depreciate the rules of the game: it gains greatly from these various quirks and irregularities. But they look like complications introduced later in order to enhance the subtlety of the game, not like principles anyone would have thought up when first inventing a new variation on the existing game of Tarot. Moreover, if the pack and the game were invented together, it is curious that, while both are rather odd, their oddities do not correspond. There is nothing in the design of the trumps to distinguish *tarocchi nobili* from *tarocchi ignobili*: one could never guess, by looking at them, that the X and the XIII were counting cards, but the XI and the XII were not, or that the XXVIII and the XXX were counting cards, but the XXVII and XXIX were not. Conversely, many special features of the design are unmatched by any feature of the play. The Queens, *Cavalli*, *Fanti* and *Fantine* look as though they should be important cards: but they are mere *cartaccie*. The most striking feature is the red backgrounds of the trumps from XXXIII upwards. Anyone looking at the cards would assume that these cards had a quite special role in the game; and yet, in fact, there is nothing to distinguish the XXXIII, XXXIV and XXXV from the cards immediately below them.

It is therefore natural to conjecture that, when it was first invented, the rules of the game were a good deal simpler. If so, it seems very probable that, originally, all the court cards were counting cards, with their usual Tarot values of 5, 4, 3, and 2. It would probably be going too far to pay attention to the fact that, in that case, if the only other counting cards were the Matto, the *Uno* and the five *Arie*, each with a value of 5, and the last trick had been worth 6 points, as in Tarocchino, there would have been a total of 97 points altogether, to tally with the number of cards in the pack, as the 78 points of three-handed Tarocco tally with the 78 cards of that pack. But we might spèculate that only the Matto, the *Uno* and the eight red-coloured cards were originally counting cards, in addition to the court cards, say with their later values of 10 points for the *Arie* and 5 points for the others. *Versicole* must have been a feature of the game from the start, but, on the present conjecture, may have included sets of three or four Queens, *Cavalli* or *Fanti*, and otherwise, save for the *Uno*, *Trombe* and Matto, have consisted solely of sequences, including sequences of court cards in one suit. In such a case, we should have had a game much more similar to Tarocchino. On this hypothesis, a change must have occurred somewhere around the turn of the sixteenth century, involving the demotion of the court cards other than the Kings and the promotion of trump cards that had previously been *ignobili*. This could have happened in stages: first the promotion of the *Papi* from II to V, with their odd value of 3 points, and of the XXX, XXXI and XXXII, and, later, the addition of the X, XIII, XX and XXVIII. All this is, of course, mere speculation, and may be on the wrong track altogether: quite possibly, the rules governing counting cards and *versicole* were a feature of the game from its origin.

The question of the antiquity of the four-handed partnership game is also puzzling. All the eighteenth-century sources treat it as the principal form of Minchiate (with the possible exception of Bernardi's volume of 1728, reprinted with additions in 1742 and again in 1773, which I have not seen). It would be highly plausible that it had always been so, since games of this form were well known in the sixteenth century; but in fact Minucci's account of 1676 does not even mention it, but, instead, briefly alludes to two-handed and three-handed forms and devotes most of the space to the four-handed game in which each plays for himself (*ad ognun per se*). It may therefore be that the partnership game was an invention of the eighteenth century; or it may be that it was much older, but was temporarily out of fashion in the later seventeenth century.

Of one feature we can feel confident that it was an innovation of the eighteenth century, namely the practice whereby the dealer, having first robbed the pack, looks through what remains of the *Fola* and extracts all counting cards from it. This practice is not mentioned by Minucci; and this omission cannot be due solely to his confining himself to the game in which each plays for himself, because Brunetti, in his account of the four-handed game *ad ognun per se*, includes the practice. Brunetti also says, however, that the four-handed game with partners is sometimes played without the practice, to which he gives the odd Spanish-sounding name of *entragnos* (*entrañas* = entrails), a word not used in other sources. Indeed, Brunetti promises to give a separate account of the partnership game without *l'entragnos*, a promise which he fails to keep. Brunetti's account of the procedure with the *Fola* is very slightly different from that given above, in that the dealer's partner plays no role. When the dealer has robbed the pack, he then, according to Brunetti, himself exposes the entire remainder of the *Fola*, and takes any counting cards contained in it for himself. He and the player to his left then make their discards (if any) face down, and the player to the dealer's right leads to the first trick. The dealer and the player to his left then expose their discards, which are then presumably put together with the rest of the *Fola* to be kept to the right of the dealer. On the assumption that, when the game is played without the *entragnos*, it is played in exactly the same way save that the dealer does not extract counting cards from the *Fola*, we arrive at the following.

Variation

All proceeds as in the foregoing account up to the point at which the dealer has robbed the pack, and has come to a card which is neither a counting card nor a trump higher than the XX. He then turns over the remaining cards of the *Fola* for all to see, but, even if it contains counting cards, he does not take them. All then pick up their cards; if the dealer or the player to his left have robbed any cards, he discards an equal number of cards, which may not be counting cards, face down. The player to the right of the dealer then leads the first card to the first trick. The dealer and the player to his left now turn their discards face up for all to see; these discards are then gathered up and placed, together with the undealt cards, face down to the right of the dealer to form the *Fola*. Declarations of *versicole* held in hand are then made in turn, starting with the player to the right of the dealer, and all proceeds as before.

It seems evident that the original intention was that the dealer should not be more privileged than the player to his left, and that the process whereby, having robbed the pack, he then extracted any remaining counting cards was a slightly clumsy device, later introduced, to ensure that all counting cards were in play.

The two- and three-handed games, briefly mentioned by Minucci, are referred to with equal brevity by Bisteghi in *Il Giuoco Pratico* (1753). Because of the cursory character of these notices, it is difficult to feel certain of how they were played; but the following represents what appears to be intended.

Two-handed Minchiate

There is no robbing of the pack. The dealer gives twenty-five cards to each player, starting with his opponent. (It is not stated how the deal is made: possibly in two rounds of eight cards each followed by one of nine.) Apparently the last card dealt to each player is not exposed. The undealt cards are not looked at, but are set aside face down. The opponent leads a card to the first trick, and then declares any *versicole* he has, and scores for them; the dealer then declares his *versicole*, scores for them, and completes the first trick. The play is under the usual rules (of course there can be no case in which a player is compelled to play a King if he has other cards of that suit or the Matto). Each player scores for any counting cards he captures from his opponent. At the end of the round, each player scores for having won the last trick, for having won the majority of the tricks, for counting cards he has won, and for *versicole* included in the cards he has won in tricks, just as in the four-handed partnership game, save that the player who has won the most tricks scores as many points as he has cards in excess of 25. That player with the lower total pays to his opponent the difference between their totals. *Resti* are used only to represent an exact number of 60 points, so that there is no distinction between points and game points.

Three-handed Minchiate

All is as in the two-handed game, the dealer giving twenty-five cards to each player, starting with the player to his right, who leads to the first trick. Settlement for declared *versicole* takes place between each pair of players, according to the difference in their scores, and the same applies to settlement at the end of the round. A player who loses a counting card during play pays its value to each of his opponents; in this game the rule requiring a King to be played if a trump is first played to the first trick in that suit does apply. If a player who has the Matto makes no tricks, he surrenders it at the end of the round to the winner of the trick to which he played it.

Much more interesting is the four-handed game in which each player plays for himself. As already mentioned, Minucci, writing in 1676, devotes most of his account to this game, and it is described in almost the same way by Bisteghi in 1753. Brunetti, writing in 1747, devotes a separate section to the game, from which, however, he omits a crucial feature of it as described by Minucci and Bisteghi; he remarks, however, that it is nowadays in disuse. This is not at all the impression given in *RGGM*, written in 1781, in which the game without partners is repeatedly referred to, as a well-known form, but is not accorded a separate description, the rules being taken to be identical with those of the partnership game. In the 1820 edition of *RGGM*, however, a new section on the game without partners is added, and this describes a form that differs at several points both from the partnership game and from that described by Minucci. It seems best, therefore, to set it out in three stages: the Minucci/Bisteghi form; the Brunetti-*RGGM* (1781) form; and the *RGGM* (1820) form.

Four-handed Minchiate without partners (first form 1676-1753)

As in the two- and three-handed games, there is no effective distinction between points and game points, *resti* being used solely as a strict equivalent of an exact sum of 60 points. The deal is exactly as in the partnership game, the player to the dealer's left robbing the pack in the process of cutting it, and the dealer robbing the pack at the end of the deal; the last card dealt to each player is exposed. If the dealer or the player to his left robs counting cards from the pack, each of the three players pays him their value; similarly, if the exposed card dealt to any player is a counting card, each of the other three players pays him its value. Minucci (1676) does not allow the dealer, after he has robbed the pack, to extract any counting cards remaining in the *Fola*; Bisteghi (1753) does. The dealer now exposes the *Fola*, and he and the player to his left make their discards face down. Now the player to the right of the dealer says, on the basis of his hand, whether he wishes to play or not. If he chooses to play, the player to his right has the same option, but not otherwise, since at least three players must play. If the first and second players have opted to play, the third player says whether or not he will play, and, if he does play, the dealer finally has the option of dropping out. A player who drops out of the round puts down his hand face down, and it is added to the *Fola*; it does not appear that any other player has the right to inspect the hand of the player who has dropped out. A player who has dropped out has, at the end of the round, to pay a certain sum to the winner of the last trick, depending upon which player it is who has dropped out. According to Minucci, if the first player (the one to the right of the dealer) drops out, he pays 30 points to the winner of the last trick; if the second player does, he pays 40 points; the third player pays 50 points; and the dealer 60 points. Bisteghi's payments are less severe: 20 points for the first player; 30 for the second player; and 40 for the third player or the dealer. According to both Minucci and Bisteghi, however, any player who, during play, loses a counting card must pay its value to the player who has dropped out as well as to each of the two other active players.

When any one of the players has dropped out, or all four have said they will play, the player to the right of the dealer, or, if he has dropped out, the second player, leads to the first trick. Then the discards of the dealer and of the player to his left are exposed and added to the *Fola*, and each of the active players declares any *versicole* he has: each pair of active players settle between themselves for *versicole*. Play to the first trick is then completed, and the hands are played out according to the usual rules; if the player with the Matto makes no tricks, he surrenders it at the end of the round to the winner of the trick to which he played it. Any player who loses a counting card in the course of the play has to pay its value to each of the other players, including one who has dropped out, as already noted. At the end of the round, points for the last trick, for the total number of cards won, for counting cards won in tricks, and for *versicole* included in cards won in tricks are reckoned in the usual way, save, of course, that each player counts up the points only on the cards he himself has won; a player who has won more than 21 cards in tricks scores as many points as he has cards in excess of 21. Settlement is made between each pair of active players, and, of course, a player who has dropped out pays to the winner of the last trick what he owes him.

Four-handed Minchiate without partners (second form 1747-81)

All is as in the preceding version, save that no player is allowed to drop out, the dealer is definitely allowed to extract counting cards from the *Fola* after robbing it, and payment is made in *resti*: at the end of the round, settlement is made between each pair of players, the one with the lower total score paying to the other 1 *resto* for every 60 points or part of 60 points in the difference between their total scores in points. The game is therefore played in every respect like the partnership game, save for the essential differences arising from the fact that each player is playing for himself.

Four-handed Minchiate without partners (third form 1820)

An additional *versicola* is recognised, consisting of the XIV (the Devil), the XXXV (the Twins) and the *Mondo*; this is called the *Demonio, Mondo e Carne* (the World, the Flesh and the Devil, the Twins being taken to represent the Flesh). It is worth 20 points, the XIV being treated as worth 5 points when included in this *versicola*.

A *versicola* containing one or more *Arie* is treated as a multiple one, that is to say, its value is multiplied by a certain figure, the multiplier. The multiplier consists of the number of *Arie* included in the *versicola*, plus 1 if the *Trombe* is included and plus 1 also if any cards that are not *Arie* are included. Thus the *Sole*, *Mondo* and *Trombe* form a quadruple *versicola*, because there are three *Arie*, one of them the *Trombe*. The *Stella*, *Luna* and *Sole* form a triple *versicola*, because it consists of three *Arie*; but the XXXV, *Stella* and *Luna* also form a triple *versicola*, because, although there are only two *Arie*, there is also a card that is not an *Aria*. The XXXIV, the XXXV and the *Stella* thus form a double *versicola*. Practice varies concerning the *versicola del Matto* or about any *versicola* to which the Matto has been added. Some do not allow the presence of the Matto to affect the value of the multiplier; some add 1 to the multiplier of any *versicola* containing the Matto, and some add 2 to it. Agreement on this point must be reached before the start of play.

The player to the left of the dealer does not rob the pack in the course of cutting it, nor does the dealer rob the pack when he has completed the deal. The deal of twenty-one cards to each player is carried out in the usual way, save that the last card dealt to each player is *not* exposed. The *Fola* of thirteen cards is now handed, face down, to the player to the right of the dealer. This player looks at his own hand, but not at the *Fola*, and may now choose to do one of two things. He may choose to play in this round, in which case he looks through the *Fola* and extracts from it any counting cards it contains; these cards belong to him, although he is not paid their value by the other players, and he makes a corresponding discard of non-counting cards. He may, alternatively, choose not to play, but to drop out of the round. In this case, he puts the *Fola*, still unseen, up for auction. The bidding is carried out in *resti* and *lupini*, 30 *lupini* being considered equivalent to one *resto*. A starting price is agreed before play for each such auction; it is usually taken to be 10 *resti*. The second player is deemed to have bid this starting price for the *Fola*; if there is no bid from the other two players, he must take the *Fola*, and is deemed to have bid 10 *resti*, or whatever starting price has been agreed, for it. Otherwise, of course, the *Fola* goes to the highest bidder. Whoever obtains the *Fola* in the auction extracts the counting cards from it and adds them to his hand, discarding an equal number of non-counting cards. The cards extracted from the *Fola*, either by the first player or, if there is an auction, by the highest bidder, are presumably shown to the other players; but the rest of the *Fola* and the discarded cards are set aside face down, and not shown to the other players. The payment to the auctioneer – the player to the right of the dealer who has dropped out of the round – is made only at the end of the round, in accordance with the principles stated below.

If the player to the dealer's right is playing, he leads to the first trick; if there was an auction of the *Fola*, the second player leads. When this lead has been made, the players declare in turn any *versicole* they have. Each records the points for the *versicole* he declares; in addition, each player is immediately paid by each of the other active players one *resto* for each *versicola* he declares. In computing these payments, a double *versicola* (e.g. XXXIV, XXXV and *Stella*) counts as two *versicole*, a triple one (e.g. XX, XXX and *Trombe*) as three *versicole*, and so on. After the declarations, play to the first trick is resumed, and the hands are played out according to the usual rules. Any player who loses a counting card subtracts its value from his current score; if this would leave a negative score, then instead each of the other active players adds its value to his score.

If there was an auction of the *Fola*, and one of the two players who did not buy the *Fola* wins the last trick, he is paid 1 *resto* by the auctioneer (the player who dropped out). A player who neither bought the *Fola* nor won the last trick, but who lost one or more counting cards in the couse of play, must pay 1 *resto* to the auctioneer. The player who bought the *Fola* pays the auctioneer at the end of the round, as already stated. The rules governing this payment are slightly complicated. Suppose, first, that he bid an exact number of *resti*, say 12 *resti*. If he neither won the last trick nor lost any counting cards, he pays his exact bid to the auctioneer, in our case 12 *resti*. If he won the last trick, then, whether or not he lost any counting cards, he pays one *resto* fewer than he bid, in our case 11 *resti*. If he did not win the last trick, but lost one or more counting cards, he pays one *resto* more than he bid, in our case 13 *resti*. This is quite straightforward: in effect, he simply pays the value of his bid, but also receives the bonus for the last trick, or pays the penalty for the death of counting cards, like the other active players.

Suppose, now, that he made a bid consisting of so many *resti* and so many *lupini*; let us say that he bid 12 *resti* and 10 *lupini*. If he lost no counting cards, all is as if he had bid only 12 *resti*: he pays 11 *resti* if he won the last trick, and 12 if he did not. If he lost counting cards to a total value of less than 20 points, 20 being the difference between the additional 10 *lupini* that he bid and the number of *lupini* (30) that make up one *resto*, again all is as if he bid 12 *resti*: he pays 11 *resti* if he won the last trick, and 13 *resti* if he did not. If he lost counting cards to the exact value of 20 points, on the other hand, he pays 12 *resti* if he won the last trick and 13 if he did not; and if he lost counting cards to a value of more than 20 points, he pays 13 *resti* whether or not he won the last trick.[6]

The active players reckon up their point-totals, which are comprised of points for *versicole* declared during the first trick, less points for losing counting cards in play, together with the usual 10 points for the last trick, points on counting cards won in tricks, and points for *versicole* contained among cards won in tricks; there are no points for having more more than 21 cards. Settlement is made between players according to the difference between their total scores, in *resti*, at the rate of 1 *resto* for 40 points or part of 40 points.

It is plain that this latest version of the four-handed game without partners was a development of the first version, not of that which did not allow a player to drop out of the round. The first version must therefore have continued to be played at the time when others were playing the second version. The strength of the four-handed game, especially in the form with partners, over the two- and three-handed games is not only that all or most of the important cards are in play, but also that at the start of play the players have a good deal of information about the whereabouts of the cards. It is a matter for much regret that a game which indeed deserved its epithet of *nobilissimo* should have died out.

In his addition of 1731 to Minucci's notes, Biscioni described two simple gambling games, *A' sei tocchi* and *Al palio*, played with the Minchiate pack. Though they are in no sense Tarot games, they may be recorded here to illustrate the sort of non-standard use to which a form of Tarot pack has been put.

A' sei tocchi

There can be two, three or four players. Seven cards are dealt to each player, which are placed face up in front of him on the table. The dealer now deals cards face up to the table one by one from the stock of undealt cards. If a player has, among the cards in front of him, a card of the same suit (including trumps) as the card turned up by the dealer, and adjacent to it in rank, above or below, he says '*Tocco*' ('I touch'), thereby claiming the card, which he takes and places face up in front of him with his other cards; e.g. the XXVI can be claimed by a player having the

---

[6] At least, this is the best understanding I have been able to attain of the somewhat confused account in *RGGM* (1820). The following system would be more rational. Whatever the original bid of the player who bought the *Fola*, the points on any counting cards he loses are converted into *lupini* and added to that bid. If he wins the last trick, he pays one *resto* less than the number of full *resti* in his adjusted bid. If he does not win the last trick, then, if the adjusted bid is an exact number of *resti*, he pays that, but if it comprises some *lupini* in addition, he pays one more *resto* than the number of full *resti* in his adjusted bid. E.g., if he bid 12 *resti* and lost no counting cards, his adjusted bid is still 12 *resti* and so he pays 11 *resti* if he won the last trick and 12 if he did not. If he bid 12 *resti* and lost counting cards to the value of 20 points, his adjusted bid is 12 *resti*, 20 *lupini*, and he pays 11 *resti* if he won the last trick and 13 *resti* if he did not; the same applies if he bid 12 *resti*, 10 *lupini* and lost counting cards to the value of 10 points. If he bid 12 *resti*, 10 *lupini* and lost counting cards to the value of 20 points, his adjusted bid is 13 *resti* (10 *lupini* + 20 *lupini* make 30 *lupini* = 1 *resto*): hence he pays 12 *resti* if he won the last trick and 13 if he did not. If he bid 12 *resti*, 10 *lupini* and lost counting cards to the value of 25 points, his adjusted bid is 13 *resti*, 5 *lupini*: in this case, therefore, he pays 12 *resti* if he won the last trick, but 14 if he did not. It will be recognised that this system, which is based on a clear principle, produces the same result as that stated in the text in every case except the last. It cannot, however, be reconciled with what is said in *RGGM* (1820), which clearly states that, in the last case, he pays 13 *resti* even if he won the last trick. What is proposed here may nevertheless have been the original rule, about which it would not be surprising if players later became confused.

XXV or XXVII, the 5 of Swords by one having the 4 or 6 of Swords. If, however, two players have cards adjacent to the card turned up (e.g. the 5 of Swords is turned up, and one player has the 4 of Swords and another the 6 of Swords), neither can claim it, and it remains in the centre of the table. If a card is turned up to which some player has both adjacent cards, e.g. the 5 of Swords is turned up and a player has both the 4 and the 6 of Swords, that player is said to have made a *pappoleggio*, and he wins the round; otherwise, the round continues until some player has acquired six cards in addition to the seven with which he started, and he is the winner. The loser or losers pay an agreed stake to the winner.

This is the basic game, but it can also be complicated by side payments called *patti*. The other players pay one chip each to the player who first acquires a card (makes the *primo tocco*), or 2 chips if he does so with the first card turned up by the dealer (*primo tocco in tavola*). They also pay 1 chip for a *guasto*, i.e. when a player has a card next but one to the card turned up (e.g. the XIX or XV when the XVII is turned up), and 1 chip also for a *privilegio*, i.e. when a player has a card next but two to the card turned up; in neither case does that player acquire the card. Finally, they pay 1 chip if a player is able to make a *versicola* with cards acquired by him and/or dealt to him at the outset. When the game is played in this more complicated way, any loser who has acquired only three cards or fewer pays a double stake.

Al palio

This is like *A' sei tocchi*, with the following differences. A game consists of several rounds: the winner of a game is the first player to win 10 points (or, among some, 12 points). When a card is turned up, it is acquired by a player who has a card closer to it than does any other player, but not necessarily one adjacent to it: but, if a player acquires a card that is in fact adjacent to one he already has, he is notionally deemed to have acquired two cards. The first player to acquire twelve cards (under this convention) scores 1 point, and the round ends. If a player acquires the first card to be turned up, and it is actually adjacent to one of his, he scores 2 points; otherwise, the first player to acquire a card scores 1 point if it is adjacent to one of his. A player who makes a *versicola* from cards dealt to him and/or acquired by him scores 1 point; but if it is a *versicola d'Arie*, he scores 2 points. A player who makes a *pappoleggio* scores 1 point, but the round does not end; but if by making the *pappoleggio* he attains his total of 12 cards acquired (under the above convention), he scores 3 points. The winner of the game receives an agreed stake from each of the other players. Side payments (*patti*) may be added as in *A' sei tocchi*.

Note on Aretino's Le Carte Parlanti

The date of this work, as containing the earliest reference to the Minchiate or Germini pack, is of some importance. S.R. Kaplan, on p. 28 of *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, after saying that Aretino wrote the third part of his *Ragionamenti* in about 1540, adds that 'The supplement dealing with cards – *Les Cartes Parlantes* – was not actually published until 1589', and cites in his bibliography (p. 349) an edition (in Italian, not French) published in London in that year, a copy of which is in his own collection. There is no earlier edition in the Bodleian Library, the British Library or the Bibliothèque Nationale; but the date, 1543, cited on p. 338 above for the first publication of this dialogue of Aretino is that given by the *Dizionario letterario Bompiani, Opere*, vol. II, Milan, 1947, s.v. *Dialogo delle Carte Parlanti*.

CHAPTER 18

Trappola

The game to be described in this chapter is not a Tarot game; it is the only game played with the regular pack of which a full account is given in this book, until we reach the last chapter. It is, however, a game whose history is of the greatest interest, not least for its curious part in the history of playing cards. Moreover, certain features of it are relevant to the speculations we shall make in Chapter 21 on the early history of Tarot in Italy. Since descriptions of Trappola are not readily accessible, it seemed worth while to include an account of it at this point.

Trappola originated in Venice in the early sixteenth century, and was, throughout that century, a very celebrated game. It was one of the earliest games to be played with a shortened pack, perhaps the earliest among indigenous Italian games. The Trappola pack is of thirty-six cards, like the earliest shortened packs in France, Germany and Switzerland. Its composition, however, was not quite the same as the shortened packs used in those countries. It followed the same general principle of omitting the lower numeral cards other than the Aces. The Aces are retained, as in the French 36-card pack, because they are the highest cards of their suits; indeed, the game of Trappola is our earliest evidence that the new practice of promoting the Aces from their position in sequence with the other numeral cards to the top of their suits had been adopted in Italy. (In France, there seems to have been an intermediate step of promoting them to just below the Jacks, the position which they occupy in the ancient game of Triomphe, dating from the early sixteenth century, and in its offshoot Écarté; in the English game of Triumph, distinct from Triomphe and the ancestor of Whist, but also dating from the early sixteenth century, it seems likely that from the start the Aces headed their suits.) Furthermore, in Trappola the old ranking of the numeral cards, whereby the lower numerals beat the higher in Cups and Coins, but the higher beat the lower in Swords and Batons, was abandoned in favour of the more rational system whereby (save for the Aces) the higher numerals beat the lower ones in all suits. Because the game had these progressive features, it is unlikely that it was in existence before the sixteenth century; certainly fifteenth-century sources, in which the names of many early Italian card games occur, make no mention of it. However, the Trappola pack is not formed by omitting the 2 to 5 from every suit, as in the pack with which Piquet was originally played; instead, the 2 is retained, and the 3 to 6 omitted. The reason for this is that, although the 2 is the lowest card of each suit, it still plays an important part in the game, of which this is, indeed, the characteristic feature. Some have inferred from this that there must have been an early form of Trappola played with the full 52-card pack; but there is not the slightest evidence for any such predecessor of the sixteenth-century game. The argument might have some weight if, at the time when Trappola was invented, there has been a familiar type of shortened pack containing 6s but not 2s; but, although we speculated in Chapter 16 that such a pack may have been known in Italy, there is no direct evidence that it was, and, if it existed at all, it was certainly less well known than the Trappola pack itself. It therefore seems much more likely that the game of Trappola and the special method of shortening the pack associated with it were invented together.

We owe most of what we know about the early history of Trappola to Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576). Cardano was a celebrated, and characteristic, Renaissance scholar, a physician and professor of medicine who concerned himself with many other subjects. He wrote numerous works, principally on medicine, but also on mathematics, philosophy, physics, astronomy, music and other topics; his name is still attached to the method of solving cubic equations, which he was the first to publish, although he credited the basic discovery to two other men. He was interested in the occult sciences, about which he wrote; he was also passionately fond of music and very badly addicted to gambling. He had a tragic domestic life. His wife died in her early thirties; his elder son made a disastrous marriage, and was executed for poisoning his unfaithful wife; his younger son was a scapegrace who was always in debt, and burgled his own father's house. Cardano wrote a short work in Latin about games, the *Liber de Ludo Aleae*; on internal evidence, it is to be dated to 1564. It was not published in his lifetime, but appeared in print for the first time, edited from his manuscript, in the collected works published at Lyons in 1663.[1] The work is of interest for many reasons, not least because it contains the earliest investigation of probability theory ever undertaken. What concerns us is that the first two-thirds of chapter 23 of the book, entitled 'On Card Games in which there is a place for Skill',[2] is devoted to a description of Trappola, which Cardano expressly characterises as a Venetian game, and which he speaks of as a game he played frequently while he was living at Sacco, a small town near Padua where he lived from 1526 to 1532.[3] In Cardano's collected works there are also to be found no less than three short treatises by him describing his own literary output.[4] In all three he tells us of a youthful work, *De Ludis*, never completed and now lost, which he wrote in Italian in 1524; it was, or was to have been, in four books, and, among card games, dealt with Primiera, Trappola and Trionfi.[5] It is sad that this early work, much fuller than the *De Ludo Aleae*, should be lost to us; but at least we learn that Trappola was already well established by 1524.

Trappola is referred to, as to something quite well known, by Francesco Marcolino da Forlí in the preface to his *Giardino di Pensieri*, published in Venice in 1540. This, it will be recalled from Chapter 5, was a light-hearted book by the use of which, with a pack of cards as an auxiliary, one could tell fortunes. The pack to be used was the 36-card Trappola pack, a fact which diminishes the probability that any other form of 36-card pack was familiar at the time, at least in Venice. The game is mentioned again in passing in Pietro Aretino's dialogue *Le Carte Parlanti* of 1543.[6] It was again referred to in the *Trattatello del Gioco* by Sperone Speroni degli Alvarotti (1500-1588), a native of Padua;[7] he cites it as being, with Primiera, one of the two principal card games for which a shortened pack is used. It figures once more in the list of card games given by Tomaso Garzoni (1549-1589) in his *Piazza Universale* of 1585.[8] John Florio has an entry for it in his Italian/English dictionary, *A Worlde of Wordes*, of 1598, retained in the second edition of 1611. Thereafter, so far as I know, references to it disappear from Italian sources. Probably it faded from popularity in its native Venice during the early seventeenth century.

This was far from being the end of its history, however, for at about the time that it was going out of fashion in Venice it travelled to Central Europe; and it took with it the Italian-suited pack, in the specially shortened form used for the game. It was popular in Bavaria in the eighteenth century, and, in Austria, Bohemia and Silesia it continued to be played from the seventeenth century right down to the twentieth; it seems to have been yet another casualty of the Second World War.[9] While it could perfectly well have been played with the 36-card German-suited pack, it never was: the Italian-suited Trappola pack went on being manufactured in those regions, all through the centuries, especially to play that particular game, in much the same way that the Spanish-suited pack continues to be manufactured in France to play the game of Aluette. Though they assumed some pronounced stylistic characteristics of the countries in which they were manufactured, Trappola cards preserved the general features of Italian cards, and some of their details;[10] the principal divergence was in the shape of the suit-signs in the Coins suit, which, in Austrian packs of the second half of the nineteenth century, came to take on the appearance of flowers. A map published in a magazine dated December 1938, showing the distribution of various standard patterns within Germany, still assigns the *Traplier-Karte* to a small area in the north of Silesia, half-way between Berlin and Breslau;[11] and a Silesian Trappola pack with a Nazi tax stamp, dating from between 1936 and 1939, is in the collection of Miss Sylvia Mann. The last Trappola pack seems to have been made in Prague in 1944.[12] Since then both the pack and the game appear to have faded from the consciousness both of card players and of card manufacturers.

---

[1] *Hieronymi Cardani Mediolanensis Opera Omnia*, edited by Carolus Sponius, in ten folio volumes, Lyons, 1663. The *De Ludo Aleae* is in tom. 1, pp. 262-76.

[2] 'De Ludis Chartarum, in quibus Industria locus est.'

[3] Excerpts from the *Liber de Ludo Aleae*, including chapter 23, will be found as Appendix X of Samuel Weller Singer's *Researches into the History of Playing Cards* (London, 1816); there is one serious misprint (*onirum* for *mirum*). An English translation of the whole book by Professor Sydney Henry Gould is given as an appendix to Oystein Ore's biography, *Cardano, the Gambling Scholar* (Princeton, 1953). Gould's translation of chapter 23 is badly at fault in places, since he evidently did not understand the game.

[4] *Opera Omnia*, as cited in footnote 1, tom. 1, pp. 55-150.

[5] See *Opera Omnia*, tom. 1, pp. 56, 61, 75, 97, 119. It will be noted that there are some inconsistencies in the description of the *De Ludis* in the different treatises, and that Cardano includes it on p. 75 as no. 35 in the list of thirty-six of his books he judges worthy of publication.

[6] See Pietro Aretino, *Le Carte Parlanti*, Venice, 1650, p. 74.

[7] See Sperone Speroni, *Opere*, Venice, 1740, vol. V, p. 441.

[8] See Tomaso Garzoni, *La Piazza Universale di tutte le Professioni del Mondo, e Nobili et Ignobili*, second edition, Venice, 1586, p. 574.

There is in Miss Mann's collection a Trappola pack made by Schmidt of Buchholz, who was recorded as a cardmaker there in 1646, and C.P. Hargrave illustrates another, dated 1664, made by Mahler of Prague;[13] yet a third, in the Historisches Museum at Frankfurt-am-Main, is dated by Dr Detlef Hoffmann to the second half of the seventeenth century.[14] Dr Ivan Honl states that the first reference to Trappola from Bohemia is from the middle of the seventeenth century, and later mentions Trappola cards, variously called *trapule, trapulky, trapulírky* and *traplírské karty*, as being subject to the general tax on playing cards introduced in 1664; and the *Zeit kurtzende Lust und Spiel Hausz*, published in Kunstberg in 1680, contains a passing reference to *Trapiliren*.[15] It is therefore plain that the game was well established in Central Europe by the middle of the seventeenth century. As time passed, the name 'Trappola', in various forms (*Trappolier, Trapplier, Trappulier, Drapulir, Trapolir, Trappelir*, etc.), came to be attached to the cards rather than to the game; Miss Mann cites the form *Traplaczka* as coming from Poland.[16] German writers appear frequently to use the expression *Trappolierkarte* to mean the Italian-suited pack in general, calling it by the name of that type of Italian-suited pack most familiar to them. So understood, their frequent remark that the Tarot pack was derived from 'the Trappolier pack' is perfectly correct, since of course the regular Italian-suited pack antedates the Tarot pack, which was formed from it by augmentation. Frequently, however, German writers incorrectly extend this observation to a claim that the game of Tarot was derived from the game of Trappola, a claim that has no foundation whatever; as we have seen, Trappola can hardly have been in existence before 1500, whereas Tarot dates from 1440 or earlier. Were it not that some people might be misled by authoritative-seeming statements to be found in the German literature upon playing cards and card games, the point would scarcely be worth labouring. The mistake stems solely from the natural, but confusing, habit of referring to any Italian-suited regular pack, whatever its composition, as a Trappola pack; an even more confusing habit, once prevalent among writers on playing cards, but happily no longer so, was that of so referring to any 36-card pack of whatever suit-system.

---

[9] See Eberhard Pinder, *Charta Lusoria*, Biberach an der Riss, 1961, p. 16, for testimony to its still being played in Silesia in this century.

[10] To judge by a very striking comparison between a sixteenth-century Italian pack and an eighteenth-century German Trappola pack made in the 1974 'Spielkarten' exhibition at the Albertina Gallery, Vienna, we could go much further and say that German Trappola cards remained remarkably faithful to the precise designs of an Italian prototype; see the catalogue, *Spielkarten: ihre Kunst und Geschichte in Mitteleuropa*, nos. 7 and 8. Miss Mann informs me, however, that both she and Dr Hoffmann have come to entertain serious doubts about the supposed Italian origin of the earlier pack, which is in the permanent collection of the Albertina (catalogue no. 305/1930).

[11] In an article by Nikola Michailow in *Westermanns Monatshefte*, vol. 83, p. 309.

[12] See *Hráči Karty: Karetní Hry*, Prague, 1969, vol. I, p. 92.

[13] See Catherine Perry Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1930, 1966, illustration facing p. 146. The maker's name is on the Ace of Batons, and the date 1664 on the 2 of Swords.

[14] See the catalogue edited by D. Hoffmann, no. 5.

[15] I. Honl, *Z Minulosti Karetní Hry v Čechách*, Prague, 1947, pp. 31, 96. The reference to the *Zeit kurizende Lust und Spiel Hausz* is Vorgemach, p. 35.

[16] Sylvia Mann, *Collecting Playing Cards*, London, 1966, p. 97.

The Italian names of the four suits were faithfully preserved by Central European card players; in Austria *Spade* and *Coppe* were often misspelled *Spadi* and *Coppi*, while in Silesia *Bastoni* and *Coppe* became *Bastan* and *Kuppe*. An eighteenth-century card-game book informs us that in Silesia the court cards and others were called by slightly garbled versions of their Italian names. The Italian name *Re* for the King had become *Reh* ('roe deer' in German); the Italian name *Cavallo* for the Cavalier had become *Cavall*, as it also did in Tarock; the name *Fante* for the Jack had become *Fantell* ('coxcomb' in German). The Ace was called either *As*, the usual German word, or *Tausend* ('thousand'), and the Deuce was called *Du*, a corruption of *due*.[17] Similar information is given by the first great historian of playing cards, Immanuel Breitkopf.[18] These names were still in use in Silesia in the 1850s, and the pack itself was called *Bastankarte* (from the suit of *Bastoni*). In Austria, however, where the pack was commonly called *Trappolierkarte*, and sometimes *Bastoni-Karte*, it was usual to use the German names, *König* and *Bube*, for the King and Jack, while the Deuce was called the *Do*.

Cardano's account of the game is not altogether easy to interpret. There are several reasons for this. The text has been printed from a manuscript, and the punctuation is wildly erratic, probably because the editor did not know the game and therefore did not understand the description. Furthermore, as often happens, Cardano assumes that his reader will know what type of game it is, and so takes certain things for granted which he ought to have stated, e.g. that it is a trick-taking game. Added to all this is the unfamiliarity of card-playing terms in Latin. If we did not have later descriptions of the game as played in Central Europe, I think we should find it impossible to gain any clear idea from Cardano's text; but, with a knowledge of how it was later played, the text becomes completely intelligible. I append to this chapter the relevant passage from Cardano, together with a translation and some notes. Here I describe the game in accordance with my interpretation of Cardano.

Trappola (Venice, sixteenth century)

Deal

Two players take part. A regular Italian-suited pack is used, shortened to 36 cards by omitting from each suit the 3, 4, 5 and 6. The dealer gives nine cards each to his opponent and himself, in two rounds, starting with his opponent, the first of four cards each and the second of five cards each. The remaining eighteen cards are placed face down on the table to form the stock. The opponent looks at his hand. If he is satisfied with it, he indicates this to the dealer. If he is not satisfied with it, he plays the hand face up on the table beside him, and takes the first nine cards of the stock to form his new hand. If this new hand still does not satisfy him, he may likewise discard it face up, and take the remaining nine cards of the stock. Having done so, he has no further option, but must play with these nine cards as his hand. If the dealer's opponent declares himself satisfied with his original hand, or with the first nine cards of the stock, the dealer now has the same option of either retaining the hand he dealt himself or discarding it face up and drawing a new hand of nine cards from the stock; if he does not like the new hand, then, if his opponent left the stock untouched, he may again discard it face up and take the last nine cards.

Play

The hands are now played out in tricks, the dealer's opponent leading to the first trick and the winner of any trick to the subsequent one. There is no trump suit; each trick is won by the highest card of the suit led. A player must follow suit whenever he is able to do so. In each suit, the cards rank, in descending order, as follows:

Ace, King, *Cavallo*, Jack, 10, 9, 8, 7, Deuce.

The Ace is called *luneta*.

Declarations

A player having three Aces in his hand may declare 'Three Aces', and one having three Kings, three *Cavalli*, three Jacks or three Deuces may declare 'Three figures'. He does not have to show the cards to his opponent, to indicate their suits or, when he declares 'Three figures', their specific rank. He may make this declaration before play begins, if he wishes, or at any stage in the play before he has played any of the cards in the set of three and before he has captured the fourth card of the set from his opponent. Likewise, if he has all four Aces, he may declare 'Four Aces', and if he has all four Kings, *Cavalli*, Jacks or Deuces, he may declare 'Four figures': he does not have to show the cards, but must make the declaration before he has played any of them. Points are awarded for such declarations as follows:

---

[17] See *Das L'Hombre-Cabinet*, Frankfurt an der Oder, 1785, p. 155.

[18] Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, *Versuch, den Ursprung der Spielkarten zu erforschen*, Leipzig, 1784, p. 25. See also K.A. Bierdimpfl, *Die Sammlung der Spielkarten des baierischen Nationalmuseums*, Munich, 1884, p. 6.

Four Aces	24 points
Three Aces	12 points
Four Deuces	20 points
Three Deuces	10 points
Four Kings, *Cavalli* or Jacks	12 points
Three Kings, *Cavalli* or Jacks	6 points

Because a declaration of three or four figures is scored differently according as the cards are Deuces or court cards, the score for such a declaration is not marked until the end of the round.

Scoring

The object of the game is not, as such, to win tricks, but to score points. Points are awarded for declarations, as already explained, for Aces and court cards among the cards won in tricks, for winning the last trick, and for winning a trick with a Deuce. The values of the counting cards are as follows:

Each Ace	6 points
Each King	5 points
Each *Cavallo*	4 points
Each Jack	3 points

No other cards carry point-values. 6 points are awarded for winning the last trick. 10 points are awarded for winning a trick with a Deuce: obviously, this can be done only by leading the Deuce at a stage at which the opponent has no more cards of that suit. If the last trick is won with a Deuce, the bonus is doubled, to make 20 points, which, with the usual 6 points for winning the last trick, make 26 points altogether. If a player wins both the last two tricks with Deuces, he is awarded 52 points, inclusive of the 6 points for the last trick; and, if he should win the last three tricks with Deuces, he is awarded 78 points in all. At the end of the round, each player adds up the points he has made on declarations, on counting cards won in tricks, on the last trick, and on tricks won with Deuces; the player with the higher point-total is the winner, and receives a payment proportional to the difference in the totals.

Variant scoring

Cardano mentions that some players award 12 points for winning a trick with a Deuce; he does not say what the score then becomes when the trick so won is the last one. It is clear, however, that the usual score for winning a trick other than the last with a Deuce was 10 points. Cardano also mentions, with disapproval, those who award 104 points in all for winning the last three tricks with Deuces; since this would hardly be likely to happen more than once in a lifetime, the fuss he makes about it must illustrate his theoretical purism rather than any practical concern.

The correctness of the foregoing account depends upon the accuracy of my interpretation of Cardano's text, which readers may judge for themselves by consulting the appendix to this chapter; but they are advised not to do so before reading the descriptions of the later forms of the game, which have guided me in estimating Cardano's intended meaning. The account also incorporates some guesses on my part about points on which Cardano is not explicit; these can also be identified by looking at the appendix. Cardano confines himself to describing the two-handed form set out above. The dominant form of the later Central European game was, however, a four-handed one with fixed partnerships, the whole pack being dealt out so that each player received nine cards. This fact, taken in conjunction with the fact that in Cardano's two-handed version, also, each player receives nine cards, makes it highly probable that in sixteenth-century Venice, too, the game was known in a four-handed form with fixed partnerships; this is, indeed, very likely to have been its original form. There may quite possibly have also been a three-handed form, each playing for himself, as there was in Central Europe; this we have no way of telling. Practically no change is required in order to adapt the above game to four- and three-handed forms.

It is not possible to follow the subsequent evolution of the game in close detail; but accounts of it are included in several German-language books on card games. The earliest of these known to me is that given in a work called simply *Kartenspielbuch*, published in Vienna some time in the 1790s; but because of the awkward interpolation of a description of a new variant form with a *Scat*, there is reason to suppose that the bulk of the account must have been copied from some earlier Austrian one. This account is followed, with certain changes of wording, in the *Neuestes Spielbuch* (Vienna 1802), the *Neuestes allgemeines Spielbuch* (Vienna 1829) and the *Neuestes Spiel-Taschenbuch* (Ulm, 1830). Another account is to be found in L. von Alvensleben's *Encylopädie der Spiele* (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1855), repeated in Friedrich Anton's work of the same name (5th edition, Leipzig, 1889), which was largely based on von Alvensleben's compilation. In the main, this account (here referred to as *ES*) tallies in content and arrangement, though not in wording, with the earlier one, save for very oddly taking the *Do* to be the 6 rather than the 2. It follows that the author did not know the game at first hand, but was recasting an older account. Certain minor divergences in the rules as stated in *ES* from those given in the *Kartenspielbuch* are therefore to be treated with reserve, but may be authentic. A brief independent account of the game, covering only the principal four-handed form without a *Scat*, was contained in Carl König's *Neuester Spiel-Almanach*, published in Berlin probably in the 1890s.

In all these works, the game is called *Hundertspiel*, from the number of points needed to win a game, or sometimes, incorrectly as the *Kartenspielbuch* remarks, *Hunderteinsspiel*; the term *Trappolir* is reserved for the Italian-suited pack with which the game is played. The name *Sechsundzwanzig* was also sometimes used for the game. The *Kartenspielbuch* tells us that chaos prevailed concerning the rules of the game, variant rules being observed in every place where it was played, and practically amongst every circle of players. If we assume that the original version was a four-handed one, however, we find that it has, in essence, changed very little from its sixteenth-century form. The major change is the introduction of a trump suit; the only other important change is the possibility of declaring at the start of the round the intention to win the last trick with a Deuce or *Do*. The *Kartenspielbuch* remarks on the great popularity of the game amongst certain sections of the bourgeoisie.

Four-handed Hundertspiel

Terminology

The suits are called *Spadi, Bastoni, Coppi* and *Denari* (or *Spady, Bastony*, etc.). The court cards are called *König, Cavall* and *Bube*, and the Deuce is called the *Do*.

Preliminaries

Four cards of different ranks, one from each suit, are selected and shuffled; each player then draws one. The two players with the cards of highest rank then become partners, as do the other two, the one who drew the lowest card becoming the first dealer. Partners face each other across the table. The trump suit in each round may be determined by cutting the pack, but the more usual custom is that the trump suit is always that of the card drawn by whoever is dealing in that round in this preliminary draw to determine the partnerships.

Deal

The 36-card Trappola pack is used. Deal and play are clockwise. The dealer gives nine cards to each player, in three rounds of three cards each, starting with the player to his left.

Play

After announcements and declarations have been made, to be described below, the player to the left of the dealer leads to the first trick. The hands are then played out in tricks, the winner of any trick leading to the next one. A trick is won by the highest trump, or, if no trump is played, by the highest card of the suit led. In every suit, the cards rank, in descending order:

Ace, King, *Cavall*, Jack, 10, 9, 8, 7, *Do*.

A player may lead any card he likes to a trick. Any other player who has cards of the suit led must either play a card of that suit or play a trump: he is permitted to play a trump even though he could follow suit. A player who has no cards of the suit led may either play a trump or throw away a card of another suit, at his choice. There is thus an absolute obligation to follow suit only when trumps are led.

Partners keep the cards won in tricks by either of them in a single pile, and one player in each partnership is responsible for keeping a tally of the score. All scores made by either partner count to both partners equally; there are no individual scores or premiums. There are four ways of gaining points: by declarations (see below); by bringing home or winning counting cards in tricks; by winning the last trick; and by winning a trick with a *Do*. The values of the counting cards are as follows:

Each Ace	6 points
Each King	5 points
Each *Cavall*	4 points
Each Jack	3 points

Other cards have no point-values. The last trick is worth 6 points. 10 points are gained by winning a trick with a *Do*. If the last trick is won with a *Do*, however, this bonus is doubled, so that the total value of the last trick won with a *Do* is 26 points, including the 6 points for simply winning the last trick. Winning the last trick with a *Do* is therefore called 'making a twenty-six'. If the same player wins both the last two tricks with *Do*s, this earns a bonus of 52 points, including the 6 points for the last trick; if one player should win the last three tricks with *Do*s, his side scores 72 points (or 78 according to *ES*). A trick can be won with a *Do* in either of two ways: by trumping with the trump *Do*, or by leading a *Do* of a plain suit when all other cards of that suit have been previously played, and without being trumped. If the first trick should be won with the trump *Do*, this earns a bonus of 52 points; the phrase 'making a fifty-two' refers, however, to the feat of winning the last two tricks with *Do*s. As a matter of strategy, not of regulation, the partner of the player who leads to the first trick should always play a trump, unless he himself has the trump *Do*, or unless a trump has already been played, to prevent the dealer from winning the trick with the trump *Do*.

Announcements

Before the player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick, any player who thinks he can make a twenty-six may announce his intention to do so by placing the *Do* with which he proposes to do it face up in front of him on the table; an announcement of intention to make a fifty-two is likewise effected by placing two *Do*s face up on the table. Such announcements do not affect the score in points, as given above, but determine payments as reckoned in game points, in a manner to be explained under *Scoring*. If a twenty-six or a fifty-two has been announced in this way, either member of the opposing side is entitled, before the player to the dealer's left has led to the first trick, to say 'Contra', thus doubling the bonus or penalty in game points. In such a case, some players allowed either the player who announced the twenty-six or fifty-two or his partner to say 'Recontra', thereby quadrupling the original bonus or penalty; either opponent could then reply 'Supercontra', thus raising the bonus or penalty to eight times its original value. Before leading to the first trick, the player to the dealer's left should ask, 'Is anything laid down?' ('*Wird etwas aufgelegt?*'), meaning, 'Does anyone wish to lay down a *Do* to announce a twenty-six or fifty-two?'. If he forgets to do this, then an announcement made by his partner, by laying down a *Do*, is invalidated, and either of his opponents may lay down a *Do* after the first card of the trick has been led.

Declarations

Before the player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick, any player may make any of the following declarations of three or four cards of a kind he holds in his hand:

Three Aces	30 points
Four Aces	40 points
Three *Dos*	10 points
Four *Dos*	20 points
Three Kings	6 points
Four Kings	12 points
Three *Cavalls*	6 points
Four *Cavalls*	12 points
Three Jacks	6 points
Four Jacks	12 points

The declaration is made by mentioning the number of cards and their rank, without showing the cards; but if three of a kind are declared, either opponent may, at the end of the first trick, ask which is the missing fourth card of that rank, and must be told. A declaration of three or four Kings, *Cavall*s, Jacks or *Do*s can be made only before the lead of the first card to the first trick. A declaration of three or four Aces, on the other hand, may be made at any stage in the game, provided that the player making the declaration has not yet played an Ace. (*ES* says that a player with four Aces may play one of them and later, before playing another, declare three Aces.) It is not obligatory to make a declaration.

Scoring

At the end of each round, the two sides agree on the total number of points each has scored. There are 72 points on counting cards, divided between the two sides, and one side will have 6 points for the last trick; in addition, either side or both may have points for declarations or for winning the first, the last or an intermediate trick with a *Do*. The points for winning the last trick, or each of the last two tricks, with a *Do* are unaffected by whether an intention to do so was announced by laying down a *Do* at the start of play, or, if so, by whether a 'Contra' was said. A game lasts, in general, for several rounds, namely until one side has attained a cumulative total of 100 or more points, or, more exactly, until one side has claimed to have attained 100 points. As already stated, during the round one player on each side keeps a running tally of the points gained by his side; points for declarations are awarded immediately, points for counting cards or for winning a trick with a *Do* on the completion of the trick. As soon as a side has reached 100 points, it may claim the game. If the claim is correct, that side wins, even if the other side reached 100 points sooner or has a higher score, but failed to notice the fact. If the claim is incorrect, the side making it has lost, even if the other side has not reached 100 points or actually has a lower score. This applies, however, only to claims made before completion of a round: if at the end of a round, both sides discover that they have 100 points or more, the opponents of the dealer are deemed to have won, regardless of whether they have the higher score. Each member of the losing side pays 1 game point to one of the two winners; but if the losing side has not attained 50 points, it is in *Matsch*, and each must pay 2 game points.

If a twenty-six is announced by laying down a *Do* at the start of play, then, if it is made, the side making it gains 26 points towards game in the usual way; but, in addition, one member of the other side pays 2 game points to the player who made the twenty-six, and the other pays 2 game points to that player's partner: this payment is independent of the payment for game. If a twenty-six is announced but not made, the player who announced it pays 2 game points to one opponent, and his partner pays 2 game points to the other; no deduction is made to the ordinary cumulative point-total of the unsuccessful side. When a fifty-two has been announced, the bonus or penalty is 4 game points. These values are doubled when 'Contra' was said, quadrupled when 'Recontra' was said and multiplied by eight when 'Supercontra' was said. (*ES* states, however, that 'Recontra' merely trebles the value and 'Supercontra' quadruples it.)

If at the beginning of the round during which one side claims to have reached 100 points and won the game any player announced a twenty-six or fifty-two, the round must be played to the end: points made in that round after game has been claimed do not count, and all that matters is whether the twenty-six or fifty-two is made or defeated. If, however, no twenty-six or fifty-two has been announced, then, as soon as one side claims game, the players throw in their hands and a new game is begun with a new round. However, if, at the beginning of a round, one side's point-total stands at 90 or more, and no twenty-six or fifty-two is announced, either side has the option of saying 'Old and new' ('*Alt und neu*'). The round is then played to the end, instead of being terminated when one side claims to have reached 100 points; settlement is made for the old game completed during the course of the round, but *all* the points made by each side in that round count towards their score in a new game.

The card-game books all treat the four-handed partnership game as the principal form, but they cursorily describe three others, one for four players, and two for three players. The descriptions are not altogether clear, but the following seems to be what is intended.

Three-handed Hundertspiel

Three players take part, each playing for himself. All is as in the preceding four-handed game, with the following exceptions. In each round, the trump suit is determined by the dealer's cutting the pack and exposing one card before reshuffling the pack and dealing. The dealer gives twelve cards to each player in two rounds of six each, starting with the player to his left. The first player to reach 100 points, accumulated over any number of rounds, collects 1 game point from a player who has reached 50 points and 2 game points from one whose total is less than 50 points. If a twenty-six is announced, 2 game points are collected from each opponent if it is successful, and 2 game points are paid to each opponent if it fails. For an announced fifty-two, 4 game points are paid by or to each opponent. When a twenty-six or fifty-two is announced, either of the two opponents may say 'Contra'; if Recontras are admitted, the player who announced the twenty-six or fifty-two may then, if he wishes, say 'Recontra', whereupon either opponent may say 'Supercontra'.

There was also a four-handed form with a talon, called the *Scat*, and a simple form of bidding, in which the suits ranked in a fixed order, as in Bridge. The *Neuestes Spielbuch* of 1802 remarks that the ranking of the suits has been borrowed from the game of Preference, a simple trick-taking game for three players played with the 32-card French-suited pack, quite popular in Austria, and that the feature of the Scat has been borrowed from Tapp-Tarok, which was then already very well known in Austria and will be described in Chapter 22. The suit of *Bastoni* being the highest-ranking one, the *Do* of that suit was called *der gute Maxel* in this game (or, according to *ES*, *der gute Magel*). Although all the accounts save that of König, who does not mention it, devote considerable space to this version of Hundertspiel, they are so inexplicit on certain points that any reconstruction must be partly conjectural. The most important obscurity is over whether it remained a game with fixed partnerships. I have described it below on the assumption that it did not, but that the successful bidder played alone against the other three players. If not, the game would be a very tame one, since the declarer (successful bidder) and his partner would almost always win, and it would be hard to see why, if all the players passed on the first round of the bidding, the player to the dealer's left would ever have any reason to pass on the second round. Nevertheless, in every single account, save that of Carl König, from the *Kartenspielbuch* and the *Neuestes Spielbuch* on, the section on this form of the game terminates with a remark implying that there are fixed partnerships. This remark is to the effect that it is impossible for five players to sit down to play Hundertspiel, with one being *König* in each round, since the players are divided into two sides. This refers to a common practice in many games whereby the dealer would take no part in the play of the round, but would sit out as '*König*' (King), often receiving the same payment as the declarer or as his opponents. In the next section, on the three-handed game, it is further remarked that this is easier for a beginner than the four-handed one, since he has to think only about himself and not about his partner. For all that, the game with the Scat would be such a poor one if there were fixed partnerships that I think it highly probable that the account of Hundertspiel in the *Kartenspielbuch* is based on an earlier one which did not mention the form with the Scat, into which the description of that form has been interpolated one paragraph too early. The name 'Hundertspiel' is, strictly speaking, no longer appropriate for the version with the Scat, in which the game was not played 100 up, each round being paid for separately; it appears, however, that the old name continued to be used for this obviously later variant.

Four-handed Hundertspiel with a Scat

The dealer puts the top four cards face down on the table to form the Scat, and then deals eight cards to each player in two rounds of four each, starting with the player to his left. The trump suit is to be determined by the successful bidder. The bidding takes place in two rounds. In the first round of the bidding, a bid is effected by announcing a twenty-six in the usual way, viz. by placing a *Do* face up on the table in front of one: if the bid is successful, the suit of that *Do* becomes the trump suit. A player who cannot or does not wish to announce a twenty-six says 'I pass' ('*Weiter*' or '*Ich passe*'); the player to the dealer's left has the first opportunity to bid. For the purpose of this round of the bidding, the suits are ranked, in ascending order, *Spadi, Denari, Coppi, Bastoni*: an announcement of a twenty-six with a *Do* of a higher-ranking suit overbids and annuls previous announcements.

If one or more announcements are made during this first round of the bidding, the player laying down the *Do* of the highest-ranking suit becomes the declarer, and plays alone against the other three, who are, for that round, in partnership against him; there is then no second round of bidding. In this case, the four cards of the Scat belong to the declarer, but are set aside and not looked at until the end of the round, when any counting cards amongst them count towards the declarer's point-total. The player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick, but, before he does so, any player may make, if he can, one of the declarations of three or four cards of a kind listed above for the partnership game. Three or four Aces may also be declared by any player at any stage before he first plays an Ace. Play is under the same rules as before.

If all pass on the first round of the bidding, there is a second round, during which only one 'bid' is possible, since it cannot be overbid. A player who wishes to become declarer simply picks up the four cards of the Scat, without showing them to his opponents, and adds them to his hand, thus terminating the bidding; a player who does not wish to do this passes in the usual way. The declarer now discards four cards from his augmented hand face down on the table beside him; he may not discard Aces or Kings. He may discard *Cavalls* or Jacks, and the points on these count towards his final point-total. Having made his discard, the declarer now announces any suit of his choice as the trump suit. Before the lead is made to the first trick, any player able to do so may make one of the usual declarations of three or four cards of a kind; as before, a declaration of three or four Aces may be made at any time before the player has played an Ace. The declarer has, however, no further opportunity to announce a twenty-six (the other players obviously will not want to), even though he may be able to make one; in this game, the only such announcement is one made in the first round of the bidding. The player to the dealer's left leads to the first trick, and play is under the usual rules.

Payment is made for each round separately, on the basis of the total points for declarations, for winning a trick with a *Do*, for winning the last trick and for counting cards won in tricks: the point-values for all these things are as before. The declarer wins if he has a higher point-total than his three opponents taken together, and loses if he has a lower one; if the point-totals are equal, there is no payment. There are two systems. The simpler one reckons each round as worth 1 game point, the declarer being paid 1 game point by each opponent if he wins and paying each opponent 1 game point if he loses. On the more usual method, the value of the round depends on which suit was trumps: 1 game point when *Spadi* were trumps, 2 game points for *Denari*, 3 for *Coppi* and 4 for *Bastoni*. If the declarer announced a twenty-six in the first round of the bidding, he is paid 2 game points by each opponent if he made it, and pays each 2 game points if he did not; this payment is independent of the payment for the round.

Apparently the conventional ranking of the suits, whether of significance only for the first round of the bidding or for the value of the round in game points, was not always that given above, but could be varied by agreement; but, of course, there is no particular point in varying it. It is possible that, when a player became declarer by announcing a twenty-six, an opponent had the right to say 'Contra' to this announcement; but, if so, this is not made explicit in the accounts.[19]

Three-handed Hundertspiel with a Scat

All is as in the four-handed game, save that the Scat is of only three cards, and the dealer gives eleven cards to each player, in a round of six each followed by one of five each, starting with the player to his left.

In Bohemia the game was known as *Špády*, and the cards as *špády karty*, from the Swords suit. The mode of play differed considerably from that of Hundertspiel, particularly in the much stronger constraints on what card one could play to a trick and in the absence of announcements of intention to make a twenty-six. As already noted, the game was known in Bohemia from the mid-seventeenth century; but the only account known to me is that given in *Hráči Karty: Karetní Hry* (Prague, 1969), a book published after the game had become obsolete, or, at least, after the pack had ceased to be manufactured. There were both four-handed and three-handed versions, but the four-handed one is said to be the better, and the account concentrates on it.

Four-handed Špády

Terminology

The suits are called *Špády*, *Baštony*, *Kopy* and *Denáry*; the Deuce is called the *Dočka* or *Dó* (capital letters are not actually used for any of these words). Winning the last trick with a *Dočka* is called a 'twenty-six', and winning the first trick with the trump *Dočka* is called a 'fifty-two': but the scoring system that gave rise to these names was no longer in use in the game as described in *Hráči Karty*.

---

[19] The *Neuestes Spielbuch* of 1802 seeks to cover the points not made explicit in the *Kartenspielbuch* account of the game with a Scat by adding to it the remark that in all other respects the same rules apply as in the original form; unfortunately, there remains some vagueness over what count as 'other respects'. I do not think I can be wrong in attributing to a dislocation of the text the plain implication that the game with a Scat is still a partnership game: interpreted as I have done, it is quite a playable game, whereas, when played with fixed partnerships, it loses all its interest, because it becomes nearly impossible to lose. Nevertheless, even as interpreted here, this variant is not really faithful to the spirit of Trappola, since it is seldom that a *Do* of any but the trump suit has any importance. Apart from the fundamental obscurity about whether or not there should be fixed partnerships, and the question whether it is permissible to say 'Contra' to an announced twenty-six, the points about which I have had to guess are the following. It is not expressly stated that the player to the dealer's left always leads to the first trick: it could be the declarer, as in Preference, but I think this likely to have been mentioned if it were so. There is no explicit statement in the text that declarations of three or four cards of a kind are allowed, but I have assumed that this is so on the strength of the statement that the usual rules apply. Conversely, it is not expressly stated that a declarer who has taken the Scat and discarded is not permitted to announce a twenty-six. However, a declarer who plays 'from the hand', that is, one who has announced a twenty-six in the first round of the bidding and has therefore not had the advantage of taking the Scat into his hand, plays a game that is much more difficult to win than one who has had that advantage, and yet the value of the round is not stated to be higher when the declarer plays from the hand, as one would expect. It therefore seems probable that he must, nevertheless, have an opportunity to make a higher score than can one who has the advantage of taking the Scat; and this can be guaranteed only if the latter is not allowed to announce a twenty-six after he has discarded. It is also not expressly stated how a twenty-six announced during the first round of the bidding is paid if it is successful: the payment might vary according to the suit, as does the payment for the round, but I have assumed that, if this were so, it would have been stated. It is also conjectural that, when a twenty-six is announced during the first round of the bidding, it is paid, whether it succeeds or fails, independently of the payment for the round. This seems, in the absence of any explicit statement, to be the most probable conjecture; but it could be that a declarer who fails to make his announced twenty-six is regarded as having lost the round even though he has made more points than the other three players together. Finally, there is no trace in the rules either of this variant or of the partnership game of any constraint similar to that governing an announced Pagat ultimo in Tarock binding one who has announced a twenty-six. In Tarock, one who has announced Pagat ultimo and sees, in the course of play, that he has no chance of making it, is nevertheless not allowed to play the Pagat until he is compelled to. But in Hundertspiel there does not appear to be a similar rule preventing someone who has announced a twenty-six, say with the trump *Do*, from playing the *Do* with which he made the announcement before he is obliged to.

Deal

The players are divided into two fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. Deal and play are clockwise. Before dealing, the dealer cuts the pack and exposes a card to determine the trump suit. He deals nine cards to each player in three rounds of three each, starting with the player to his left; this player leads a card to the first trick as soon as he has looked at his hand. The card led to the first trick may not be a trump.[20]

Declarations

After the first card has been led to the first trick, each player in turn, starting with the one to the dealer's left, has an opportunity to make one or more declarations of cards held in hand. The possible declarations are as follows: (i) three Aces, three Kings, three Cavaliers, three Jacks or three *Dočka*s; (ii) all four cards of any of these ranks; (iii) *blanche* – a hand containing no court cards; and (iv) *bianca* – a hand containing no court cards or Aces. The cards do not have to be shown; in announcing three of a kind, a player states the rank of the cards, but does not say which one is missing; in announcing four of a kind, he must again state their rank. The values of these declarations are:

Three of a kind	5 game points
Four of a kind	10 game points
Blanche	5 game points
Bianca	10 game points

Play

When each player has had a chance to make a declaration, play to the first trick is resumed, and the hands are played out in tricks. The ranking of the cards is as in Hundertspiel. A player who can do so is obliged to follow suit. If a trump has not yet been played to the trick, or when a trump has been led, a player who can follow suit is obliged, if he can, to play a card higher than any yet played to the trick. A player who cannot follow suit is obliged to play a trump if he has one, and, in doing so, to play a higher trump than any yet played, if he can.

Scoring

Each side keeps in a single pile the cards that either partner has won in tricks. The side that wins the round is determined solely by the points on the counting cards won in tricks, which are the same as in Hundertspiel, together with 6 points which go to the winners of the last trick: there are thus always exactly 78 cards points divided between the two sides. A side gaining 40 or more card points marks +10 game points, and their opponents mark −10 game points; all scores are kept in this way, so that the sum of the scores of the two sides is always 0. The scores for declarations and for winning a trick with a *Dočka* are recorded separately, and do not affect the card points which alone determine which side has won the round. The scores for declarations were given above: the side making the declaration marks the corresponding positive sum, and the other side marks the equivalent negative sum. A side that wins an intermediate trick (neither the first nor the last) with a *Dočka* marks +5 game points, and the other side −5. For making a twenty-six, i.e. winning the last trick with a *Dočka*, a side scores +10 game points (and the other side marks −10); for making a fifty-two, i.e. for winning the first trick with the trump *Dočka*, a side scores +20 game points (and the opponents mark – 20). No mention is made of any special bonus for winning the last two tricks with *Dočka*s; it is possible that this is an oversight, and should be scored as a fifty-two. In a round in which *Kopy* are trumps, all scores for winning the round, for winning an intermediate trick with a *Dočka* and for making a twenty-six or a fifty-two are doubled: the scores for declarations are unaffected. If both sides make 39 card points, declarations and tricks won with *Dočka*s are scored for, but there is no payment for the round: in the following round, all scores, including those for declarations, are doubled, and, if *Kopy* are trumps in that following round, then the scores for winning the round and for winning tricks with *Dočka*s are redoubled.[21]

---

[20] *Hráči Karty* says that the penalty for leading a trump to the first trick is that the trump *Dočka* is, for that trick, promoted to the head of the suit, so that the player holding it can win the trick with it. It is probably best to construe this as meaning that either of the *opponents* can, in this case, win the trick with the trump *Dočka*: it would surely afford too gross an incentive for cheating if it were allowed that, if the partner of the player making the lead happened to hold the *Dočka*, he could profit by his partner's misdemeanour by winning the trick with it and thereby making a fifty-two. The point of the rule prohibiting the lead of a trump to the first trick was, evidently, to prevent the chance of a fifty-two being blocked; but the question arises whether leading a trump to the first trick was regarded as definitely illegal, or merely as highly dangerous, given the special power of the trump *Dočka* in this case. If it was illegal, such a breach of the rules could nevertheless be committed with impunity by the player leading to the first trick if he himself held the trump *Dočka*, but ought not to be. If, on the other hand, it were regarded as not actually illegal, but merely dangerous, it would be good play for the first player, when he held the *Dočka* of the trump suit, to lead another card of that suit as a signal to his partner that he held the *Dočka*. (It would, of course, be monstrous if he were allowed to win the trick by simply leading the *Dočka* itself.) The text of *Hráči Karty* does not allow this point to be decided.

[21] Again, I have made a few obvious guesses concerning

Three-handed Špády

Each player plays for himself. The dealer gives twelve cards to each player, in four rounds of three each. The scoring system is not properly explained. Presumably a player making a declaration or winning a trick with a *Dočka* marks twice its value as given for the four-handed game, while each opponent marks a negative score equivalent to the simple value: e.g. a player declaring three Kings marks +10 game points, while each of the other two mark −5 game points. Various possibilities are conceivable as regards payment for the round. (i) The player making the highest number of card points scores +20 game points, each of the others scores −10; if two players make an equal number of card points, and the third makes fewer, the first two each mark +10 game points, and the third marks −20. (ii) The player making the highest number of card points scores +10 game points, the player making the fewest card points scores −10 game points, and the third player scores nothing; if two players have equal point-totals, they score +5 or −5 game points each, according as the other player has a lower or higher total. (iii) A player scores positively if he makes more than 26 card points (+10 game points if there is one of them, +5 if there are two, or +20 if there is one and +10 if there are two), and negatively if he makes less than 26 card points (−10 game points if there is one, −5 if there are two, or −20 if there is one and −10 if there are two). In the absence of further information, there is no saying which of these systems, or some other, is the right one.

It is evident that, save for the introduction of trumps, which may have taken place soon after its arrival in Central Europe in the seventeenth century, the game of Trappola changed comparatively little, except in name, throughout its long history. It is sad that this excellent and picturesque game should, like so much else, have died out in our destructive century. But, though it no longer entertains card players, it continues to entertain collectors of playing cards, for whom the unusual and charming packs specially produced for playing this one game have a great appeal.

Appendix

I give here the relevant part of Cardano's text, consisting of the first two thirds of Chapter 23 of the *Liber de Ludo Aleae*, as printed in the *Opera Omnia*, Tom. 1, pp. 271-2. For the text itself I give the original punctuation, although it is hopelessly incorrect; on the right is my own translation, and I have interspersed a running commentary. Readers who know Latin will thus be able to judge for themselves whether or not I have understood Cardano aright.

Cum ergo in hujusmodi exerceamus industriam in re incognita, necesse est, ut memoria earum, quas deposuimus, aut teximus, aut reliquimus, aliquid possit, in quibusdam autem plurimum, ut in trapola, Veneto ludo.	Now when we exercise our judgment in a game of imperfect information of this kind, it is necessary that we should be able to remember something about the cards we have played, or that have been played by others, or that we have set aside; this is so above all in the Venetian game of Trappola.

Literally, 'about those we have laid down, or covered, or left'. *Earum* is obviously to be understood as meaning 'those cards'; when you play to a trick, you cover the cards already played. *In hujusmodi* is plainly elliptical for *in hujusmodi ludo*; 'a game of imperfect information' is only verbally anachronistic – Cardano has made precisely this distinction in the short preceding chapter 22, speaking of *eventu rei aperte* and *eventu rei occultae*.

Hoc eximiuntur tria, quatuor, quinque, & sex puncta. In quatuor generibus sunt sexdecim, relinquuntur triginta sex.	In this game there are omitted the 3s, 4s, 5s and 6s. This makes sixteen cards from the four suits, so that there are thirty-six cards remaining.

Tria puncta means 'the three-spot' in American diction.

Dantur quinque post quatuor; in duobus lusoribus sunt decem octo chartae totidem in cumulo relinquuntur; si primo placent, retinet, etsi secundo displicent, mutat, & novem primas recipit superiores in cumulo; si placent, & ipse suas retinet; si non	The cards are dealt out in a round of four followed by a round of five. When there are two players, there are eighteen cards left in the stock. If the first player likes his hand, he keeps it; and, if the second player does not like his hand, he changes it, and takes the top nine

---

points about which the text was not fully explicit. The score for a fifty-two is said to be higher than for a twenty-six, but is not expressly stated to be double; likewise, it is stated that there is a bonus for winning an intermediate trick with a *Dočka*, but not stated what it is. The supposition that the values of these feats are 20 game points and 5 game points respectively is hardly likely to be incorrect.

commutat cum secundis cumulis; vides igitur quantum possit memoria, judicio, scientia cavendi dolos, & securitate debita.

cards of the stock; if he likes them, he too keeps them to be his hand; if not, he again changes them for the nine remaining cards. You see, then, how much may depend upon memory, judgment, a knowledge of how to beware stratagems and a due precaution.

The Latin says merely 'with two players', leaving it open whether there were forms for three or four players; Cardano discusses only the two-handed form. It is to be presumed that 'the first player' (almost certainly the opponent of the dealer) also had the option of discarding his hand if he chose. It would clearly be unfair if a player discarding his hand were allowed to set it aside face down, since he would then have a better knowledge of the distribution of the cards than his opponent; hence, in my account of the game in the body of this chapter, I have assumed that he makes his discard face up, although Cardano is not explicit on this point. Cardano does not say whether the first player has the option of twice discarding his hand, as does the second player if the first makes no discard; I have assumed in my account that he does. If there was a three-handed form of the game, presumably each player again received nine cards, and the first player had the option of exchanging his hand for the nine undealt cards, and, failing him, the second, and, failing both, the third. As in the next passage, I have hedged in translating *dolos* as 'stratagems': it probably refers to skilful play, but it could refer to actual cheating, about which Cardano speaks a good deal in his book.

Plures ergo dum satis bene memorantur, non satis vitant caute dolos collusoris, aut non prudenter ludunt, aut timidè nimis, vel quasi iracunde. Propterea cum in Saccense oppidum, me contulissem, hoc ludo mirum in modum delectabar; ex quo omnis boni initium habui. Namque industria effeci, ut omnium chartarum, quas deposuissem, memor semper essem. Ars verò in ludendo plurimum valet.

Now many players, while they remember well enough, do not avoid the stratagems of their opponent with sufficient caution, or else play imprudently, or too timidly, or as if in a bad temper. Consequently, when I had settled in the town of Sacco, I used to delight in this game to a marvellous degree; it was from that that all my good fortune began. For I made the effort always to remember all the cards that I had played. Skill is indeed of the greatest value in the play.

In the last sentence, the Latin could mean 'in play' in general: but, since Cardano has earlier spoken of games of pure chance, in which skill counts for nothing, it is unlikely to do so.

Namque ultimam chartam, qui obtinet, sex habet puncta, si eadem binarius sit, valet xxvj. sex quoniam in ultimo: Decem quia cum sit minima, nisi sit sola, non potest non vinci: in ultimo verò duplicatur, ideo valet viginti, cui addito sex, valet viginti sex; si bis hoc contingat, scilicet, ut penultima sit binarius, & ultima, valent lij, scilicet singulae xxvj. sin autem tres binarij valent lxxviij. ter scilicet multiplicato xxvj. ut sint ultima penultima, ante penultima omnes binarij sunt, qui velint valere centum, & quatuor duplicato lij. sed non est rectum, sic enim oporteret, et ultima valeret xxvj. penultima cum ultima lxxviij. & antepenultima cum reliquis duabus ccxxxiv. quod nemo admittit

For the player who wins the last trick gains six points. But if he wins it with a Deuce, it is worth 26, including the six for the last trick. Ten points are gained for a trick won by a Deuce: unless the Deuce is the sole remaining card of the suit, it cannot but be beaten, since it is the lowest card. In the last trick, however, these ten points are doubled, making twenty points: so twenty points, with six added, come to twenty-six. If this happens twice, that is, if both the last trick and the last but one are won by Deuces, it is worth 52 points, i.e. each trick is worth 26 points. But if the last three tricks are won by Deuces, it is worth 78 points, that is, 26 multiplied by three. There are those who want to value the last three tricks won by Deuces at 104, i.e. 52 doubled; but this is not correct. For, on this principle, the last trick ought to be worth 26 points, the last but one together with the last 78 points, and the last but two together with the other two 234 points, which no one allows.

This not very clearly written passage would be quite unintelligible if we did not know the game as later played; its obscurity is compounded by the hopelessly erratic punctuation. (For instance, there should be no comma in *sunt qui velint*, but a full stop after the preceding *binarii.*) Further confusion is caused by Cardano's lack of a word for 'trick'. What he literally says is that you get six points for capturing the last card, which is of course equivalent to winning the last trick; but he goes on to speak of the last card as being worth 26 points if it is a Deuce, which cannot be what he means, since, taken literally, the last and the penultimate cards would both be in the last trick, and it is obvious that his discussion of the proper score for three Deuces at the end does not refer to the case when two of them are played to the last trick. Even if we did not know the later game, we might reflect that he cannot be talking about Deuces captured in tricks, since otherwise a Deuce would be given a point-value, like the high cards; and his remark that a Deuce is bound to be beaten unless no other cards of the suit remain shows that what he is talking about are cards led and winning their tricks. With the help afforded by a knowledge of the later game, the passage becomes perfectly clear, and can hardly be translated otherwise than I have done. The argument at the end is very compressed, and not easy to follow. It is this: to score 52 points for making the last two tricks with Deuces, but 104 for making the last three, is in effect to award 26 points to each of the last two tricks but 52 points to the last trick but two. But, if we are going to double the value of the last trick but two, we ought to do the same for the last trick but one, valuing it as 52 points and thus awarding 78 points altogether for making the last two tricks with Deuces. We should then have to value the last trick but two at twice 78, i.e. 156 points, making 234 points in all for the last three tricks made with Deuces. The last step in this argument is not cogent: we might value the last trick but two at 104 points, or at 78; but Cardano is surely right that the score of 104 points for the last three tricks cannot be rationally defended.

istiusmodi tamen constant consuetudine, aut pactis, quemadmodum, & quòd binarius, si sit prima, ut etiam in reliquis, nec vincatur, quoniam eo genere chartarum careat collusor decem valet, apud aliquos tamen valet xij.	But they agree on a custom, or, rather, convention, to the effect that, in all the other tricks, if a Deuce is played first to the trick and is not beaten, because the opponent lacks cards in that suit, it is worth ten points; but, among some players, it has a value of 12 points.

This should be punctuated as a separate sentence: it repeats the information that winning any trick with a Deuce is worth ten points. In his translation, Gould construes *vincatur* as belonging to the apodosis of the conditional, and thus takes the convention to be that, in certain circumstances, the Deuce cannot be beaten. So understood, the passage would be reminiscent of the curious rule in Špády allowing the trump Deuce to win if trumps are led to the first trick, as explained in footnote 22. But it is hard, on this interpretation, to see what the special circumstances are (when a player has a singleton Deuce?). Moreover, the sentence can hardly be so construed: *quod* never takes a subjunctive, and the verb *valet* would be left without a subject. Hence *vincatur* must be part of the protasis, with *nec* having its usual meaning 'and not': the condition is *si sit prima ... nec vincatur*, 'if it is played first and is not beaten'; the convention is that, in this case, it is worth ten points. Admittedly, this leaves *ut etiam in reliquis*, which I have taken as a clumsy way of expressing that this happens in any but the last trick, or in the last two or three consecutively, as very awkwardly interpolated, and not as contrasted with *prima*, as Gould takes it. On any possible interpretation of this sentence, it is plain that Cardano's game was played without trumps; if there were trumps, it would not hold good that the Deuce of a suit in which the opponent was void would win, nor that, as Cardano says in the preceding passage, a Deuce could win only in this case.

Pedes valet puncta tria. Regina, vel Equus, quatuor, Rex quinque, punctum unum vocant lunetam aeque supremum in suo genere, vicitque Regem, & omnes alias chartas, valet sex,	The Jack (Footsoldier) is worth three points. The Queen, or the Cavalier (Horse), is worth four; the King is worth five; the Ace, likewise, is called the *luneta* and is the highest card in its suit, beating the King and all the other cards: it is worth six points.

From other places in the book, it is apparent that Cardano was familiar with French-suited cards, and indeed preferred them. The phrase *punctum unum* denotes the one-spot or Ace; what *luneta* means and why it was applied to the Ace, I do not know. Note that Cardano thinks it necessary to explain the trick-taking power of the Ace.

tres lunetae ante ludum valent xij. tres binarij x. tres Reges, aut Equi, vel Reginae, vel Pedites sex, nec opportet, nisi in lunetis dicere, quales sint; sed cum binario omnes nominis figurarum appellantur. Oportet autem tres esse similes, & unius generis, ut tres binarij, vel tres Reges, nec est necesse, ut lunetas, vel figuras ab initio ludi appellemus, sed solum, antequam ullam ex illis tribus detegamus, aut ludamus, vel ludendo, dum non collegerimus illarum	Three Aces (*lunetae*) in hand before the game are worth 12 points; three Deuces 10; and three Kings, Cavaliers (or Queens) or Jacks are worth six. It is not necessary, except in the case of the Aces, to state their rank: all the others, including Deuces, are declared as 'figures'. It is necessary, however, that the three should be of one and the same rank, such as three Deuces or three Kings. It is not necessary to declare Aces or figures at the beginning of play, but only before we have

ullam; si quis omnes chartas obtineat, cucum vocant duplicaturq; totus numerus.	exposed, or played, any of the three, or, in play, so long as we have not collected any of them. If someone gets all the cards it is called *cucus* and the whole score is doubled.

By itself, the phrase *nec oportet … dicere quales sint* (literally, 'and it is not necessary … to say what they are') might mean merely that one need not reveal the suits of the three cards declared; but this interpretation could not be squared with the following remark that, save for Aces, but including Deuces, all are declared simply as 'figures'. One may make the declaration at any time before one has played one of the three cards: *detegamus* seems a better reading that the *delegamus* given by Singer. The phrase *vel ludendo, dum non collegerimus illarum ullam* is a puzzle: it is difficult to see how one can collect any of a set of three of a kind except by playing it to a trick and winning that trick, in which case the phrase unnecessarily repeats what has already been said. For this reason, in my account of the game in the body of this chapter, I have understood the phrase as meaning that if one wins a trick containing the fourth card of the same rank as one's set of three, one can no longer declare that set; this involves reading the *illarum ullam* ('any of them') of this clause as contrasting with the *ullam ex illis tribus* ('any of those three') of the preceding one. There is, however, no support for this interpretation in the rules of the later forms of the game, and it is highly tentative; it would provide a very strong incentive for making one's declarations early. The last sentence, beginning *si quis*, might naturally be taken to mean that, if a player won all the tricks, his entire score was doubled: the *totus* before the *numerus* tells in favour of this. However, since the remark occurs in such close conjunction with the statement of the rules governing declarations of three of a kind, and since otherwise nothing is said about a set of all four cards of a kind, I think it much more likely to mean that if one has all the cards of one of the privileged ranks (Aces, court cards and Deuces), then the score for a declaration is doubled; and I have incorporated this interpretation into my account of the game.

Apart from his failure to specify that Trappola is a trick-taking game and to make clear that the first player is the dealer's opponent, Cardano also omits to say whether it is obligatory to follow suit; but, since such a constraint almost always obtains in European trick-taking games of whatever period, it is reasonable to assume it in this case, as I have done in my account. Save for these oversights, Cardano's account covers every detail of play and scoring. The agreement with later forms is remarkable: even the awards for declarations are the same as in Hundertspiel, save for the lower valuation of three or four Aces. We should not expect that in Cardano's day there was any distinction between card points and game points; such a distinction is always a later development, and presumably players settled simply on the basis of the difference in their point-totals.

Concerning his lost youthful work *De Ludis*, Cardano wrote in his *Libellus de Libris Propriis, cui titulus est, Ephemerus*:

> At that time I wrote a book about chess, which I finished at the age of 23; it was a book of the length of that of the historian Justin, and written in my mother-tongue, because I considered that those who enjoy games are, for the most part, far from learned. I divided it into four books. The first was about chess, the second about the game of *fritillus*, the third about card games, as they are called, and the fourth about games with dice. I described forty games, and the stratagems that people are accustomed to use in them, and the arithmetical means of winning: means so remarkable that many who read the book, admiring their ingenuity and wonderful skill, would gain from it a faith in serious things (*Opera Omnia*, tom. 1, p. 56).

Fritillus was a form of backgammon; the expression I have translated as 'chess' is *ludus latrunculorum*, the name of a game of the backgammon type played in ancient Rome and quite incorrectly identified by mediaeval and Renaissance writers with chess. In the *Liber de Libris Propriis*, Cardano gave the following account:

> In the following year I was nominated Rector of the University … I then wrote a miscellany *De Ludis*, which in the course of time I arranged in four books. The first of these was finished, and was on chess and other games which required judgment alone. It consisted of a hundred pages; by a 'page', I understand ones like those in my book *De Subtilitate*, in the Basle edition. At the beginning of the work I put *Non per vitio alcuno*: it was written in my mother-tongue. The second book was on games which depend solely on luck, such as dice and Primiera; there were 20 pages, and that part was finished. The third book was on games which depend on luck and on skill applied to restricted information, such as Trappola and Trionfi. The fourth book was on games depending on luck and on skill applied to shared information, such as the game of *fritillus* and many others (*Opera Omnia*, tom. 1, p. 61).

Subsequently the *De Ludis* appears (ibid., p. 75) as no. 35 in a list of thirty-six of his books which Cardano judged worthy of publication, in addition to thirteen that had already been published, and as consisting of four books occupying 200 pages (see also no. 5 on p. 74). Finally, in the *De Libris propriis, eorumque usu liber recognitus* Cardano wrote as follows:

> When I was made Rector of the University at the age of 24, I wrote some books on games: however, I finished only the first of these; it contained nearly a hundred and fifty pages, in Italian. At the beginning was *Non per vitio alcuno* ... However, as a result of cares and business, and also of nobler studies, I scarcely finished it in thirty years (*Opera Omnia*, tom. 1, p. 97).

Later on, in a list of his books (ibid., p. 119), he includes the *De Ludis* as consisting of a single book of 150 pages, and subsequently (p. 120) lists it as among his almost completed books, and also (p. 121) as no. 47 of forty-nine of his books worthy of being read. It is also mentioned in his autobiography, *De vita propria*, this time as consisting of two books (*Opera Omnia*, tom. 1, p. 41, column 1).

Some discrepancies will be observed between these various references, and it is obscure how much of the book had actually been written. But, even allowing for Cardano's relentless self-admiration, we may much regret the fact that it was not completed and did not survive even in manuscript: it would be fascinating to read the descriptions of some forty different games and the strategic analysis of chess and other games due to so powerful a mind as that of Cardano.

CHAPTER 19

Sicilian Tarocchi

On 15 May 1860 Garibaldi, having landed in Sicily a few days earlier at Marsala with his 'Thousand', defeated three thousand Bourbon troops at Calatafimi, which lies, short of Alcamo, on the main road from Marsala to Palermo, just after its junction with the road from Trapani and close by the ancient temple and theatre at Segesta. To-day there is at Calatafimi a club for professional men called the Circolo 15 maggio. This club is one of the few remaining places in the whole of Sicily where the game of Tarocchi is still played. Anyone fortunate enough to be invited to visit this club who knows anything of the game of Tarot as played elsewhere will receive something of a surprise. The game played at Calatafimi is unlike any other. That, of course, is not in itself surprising; but what differentiates it from every other form of Tarot is that, while there are altogether twenty-three counting cards, the trump I (the Bagatto) is not one of them and the trump II (the *Papessa*) is. The pack used by the players at Calatafimi is the 78-card Tarocco Piemontese, from which they omit the Ace to 3 of Coins and the Ace to 4 of the other three suits, leaving 63 cards. Presented only with this game, we should be faced with a historical puzzle that we should have no means of solving.

Some of the older players at Calatafimi can help to resolve it. These players remember that, before the Second World War, the same game was played with quite a different pack, a Tarot pack of a type peculiar to Sicily and manufactured by the firm of Guglielmo Murari of Bari, a firm founded in 1890. During the war, however, the Murari factory was destroyed by bombing, and the firm went out of existence. The players at Calatafimi then found themselves deprived of their supply of Tarocco Siciliano packs, and believed them to be no longer obtainable; they therefore adapted their game to the Tarocco Piemontese pack, with which they have been playing it ever since: the younger players have never seen it played with anything else.

In fact, the Calatafimi players are wrong: the Tarocco Siciliano pack, one of those still resolutely remaining single-ended, continues to be produced to this day, by the firm of Modiano in Trieste. When the Murari factory was destroyed, a small printing firm named Concetta Campione, in Catania, stepped into the breach and began to produce Tarocco Siciliano packs to a new design of their own, which I am told by Signor Gaetano Di Bernardi, who comes from Calatafimi although he now lives in Palermo, differed noticeably from that of the Murari pack, a specimen of which I have never myself seen. The Calatafimi players remained unaware of the production of Tarocco Siciliano packs by Concetta Campione, and equally unaware of the intervention of Modiano, who at some time in the 1960s began to produce Tarocco Siciliano packs tallying exactly in design with those of Concetta Campione, though much less crudely drawn, and so drove the Sicilian firm, which is still in business as a printer, out of the playing-card market.

Those who play Tarocchi at Calatafimi believe that they are the only ones left in the whole of Sicily who still play the game. In this, also, they are mistaken; if they were not, neither Concetta Campione nor Modiano would have had any outlet for their Tarocco Siciliano packs. In fact, the game is also played, this time with the Tarocco Siciliano pack, in two small towns in the province of Messina, Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto and Tortorici. In both places, it is played in a manner closely related to, but clearly distinct from, that in which it is played at Calatafimi; and, in both, Tarocco Siciliano packs are readily available. The players in these two not far distant towns are well aware of each other; they are aware, also, that Tarocchi is also played at Calatafimi, though they do not know of the particular mode of play there observed, and say that it is only in these three localities that the game is any more played in Sicily; in this they are very probably right.

It was the manufacture of the pack by Modiano which first drew the attention of most playing-card collectors to its existence. A few had known it in its Concetta Campione version, and it is possible that a Murari pack is lurking in some little publicised collection, though I doubt it. But certainly no mention of the Tarocco Siciliano pack is made in any of the literature on playing cards; even so recent a work as Detlef Hoffmann's *Die Welt der Spielkarte* (Leipzig, 1972) passes it over in silence. All admit only three principal types of Latin-suited Tarot pack: the 78-card pack that eventually developed into the Tarocco Piemontese; the Tarocco Bolognese; and the Minchiate pack. Probably until the end of the Second World War, except within the firm of Murari, the Tarocco Siciliano pack was known to nobody, card player, scholar or collector, outside Sicily.

A brief inspection of a Tarocco Siciliano pack will reveal it as differing from other Tarot packs far more than does the Tarocco Bolognese. To start with, while most Tarot cards are considerably larger than the average for playing cards, the Sicilian ones, like those of the regular Sicilian-pattern pack, are considerably smaller. Examination of the trump cards at once yields an explanation of the otherwise baffling practice of the players at Calatafimi in treating the II, but not the I, as a counting card. There is the usual complement of twenty-one trumps, the card corresponding to the Bagatto, known in Sicily as the *Bagotti*, or, more usually, the *Picciotti*, being numbered 1. But, unlike every other form of Tarot pack, the Tarocco Siciliano has the peculiarity that, in it, there is a trump ranking lower than the *Bagotti*: in the modern version of the pack, this is an unnumbered card bearing the inscription MISERIA and depicting a beggar holding a bowl and chained by his other wrist to a block set in the ground. The twenty-one trumps are thus made up of the Miseria, which is not a counting card, and twenty trumps, all higher than it, numbered in Arabic numerals from 1 to 20. When, at Calatafimi, the Tarocco Siciliano was replaced by the Tarocco Piemontese, the subjects and even the numbering of the trump cards was ignored, and only the order regarded: so the I or Bagatto of the Tarocco Piemontese was made to correspond to the lowest trump, the Miseria, of the Tarocco Siciliano, and the II or *Papessa* of the Tarocco Piemontese to the 1 or *Bagotti* of the Tarocco Siciliano.

Many of the trump subjects coincide with those of other packs, but there are some unusual ones, and some of the usual subjects are represented in an unusual way. The Hanged Man (11) is in the modern pack shown hanged from a tree, and not by the foot, as in all other Tarot packs, but by the neck. The Tower (15) shows a tower, but not in the process of destruction; there are no human figures, no falling masonry and no lightning. In this it is the opposite of the corresponding card in the Belgian Italian-suited Tarot pack, which shows lightning but no tower. The Star (16) shows a young man on horseback, holding up a circle with a star in it; the Moon (17) shows a young woman pointing to a man sleeping under a tree beneath the Moon; the Sun (18) shows the Sun looking down on a scene of a man with a club about to strike another who lies on the ground (Cain and Abel?). What corresponds in other packs to the World is in Sicily called *la Palla* (the Globe) or *l'Atlante* (Atlas) and shows Atlas as a naked man kneeling on the ground and bearing the world upon his shoulders; this is no. 19. (A similar conception is found in Mitelli's Tarocchino pack.) The unusual subjects occur on nos. 4, 14 and 20. 4 is *la Costanza* (Constancy), represented as a young woman wearing a breastplate and holding a shield and a spear with a pennant; 14 is *il Vascello* (the Ship), and shows a sailing ship very similar to that on trump XXI of the Minchiate pack; and 20 is *Giove* (Jupiter), shown in the modern pack seated on a crag, brandishing a thunderbolt in his upraised right hand, with his eagle beside him. None of the trump cards other than the Miseria bears any inscription except the numeral. Nowadays, the trumps from 2 to 15 inclusive are referred to only by number. In detail, the trumps of the Tarocco Siciliano are, in ascending order, as follows; I have given Italian names only when they are in use to-day or there is some earlier attestation for their being used in Sicily.

la Miseria (Destitution)
1 – *i Bagotti* or *i Picciotti*
2 – the Empress
3 – the Emperor
4 – *la Costanza* (Constancy)
5 – Temperance
6 – Fortitude
7 – Justice
8 – Love
9 – the Chariot
10 – the Wheel of Fortune
11 – the Hanged Man
12 – the Hermit
13 – Death
14 – *il Vascello* (the Ship)
15 – *la Torre* (the Tower)
16 – *la Stella* (the Star)
17 – *la Luna* (the Moon)
18 – *il Sole* (the Sun)
19 – *la Palla* (the Globe) or *l'Atlante* (Atlas)
20 – *Giove* (Jupiter)

The eccentricities of its trumps by no means exhaust the peculiarities of the Tarocco Siciliano. It is, to start with, a shortened pack, though not shortened in the same way as the Tarocco Bolognese. It contains 64 cards, comprising the twenty-one trumps, the Fool, called in Sicily *il Fuggitivo* (the Fugitive), and 42 suit cards. From the Coins suit, the 2 and 3 are omitted; from the other three suits, there are omitted the Ace, 2, 3 and 4. Furthermore, it is a Portuguese-suited, not an Italian-suited, pack. This statement holds good not merely in the qualified sense in which we said in Chapter 17 that the Minchiate pack might be classified as Italo-Portuguese on the strength of its straight Swords and Maids in two of the suits; the Tarocco Siciliano is a full-blooded Portuguese-suited pack, as is even more evident in its earlier versions than in its modern one. It is true that there is no dragon on the only Ace, the Ace of Coins; but this, as we shall see, is not significant. In the modern pack, the Swords are straight but intersecting, and the Batons are cudgels, very similar to those in the regular Sicilian pack, which is Spanish-suited, but, again, they intersect. The Kings and Queens are seated, and, in all four suits, the lowest court card is a Maid, called *Donna*. The numeral cards have indices in the centre of the top and bottom of each card, consisting of a numeral followed by the initial letter of the name of the suit (S for *Spade*, B for *Bastoni*, C for *Coppe* and O for *Oro*): this is a characteristic feature of all Portuguese-suited packs used in parts of Europe other than Portugal itself. The Tarocco Siciliano is, in fact, the last surviving Portuguese-suited pack used in Europe. The presence of a Portuguese-suited pack in Sicily is, indeed, at first sight surprising: for Sicily, ruled by Spanish Viceroys for two and a half centuries, until 1713, never had any contact with Portugal.

As already remarked, the Modiano designs differ very little from those of the preceding Concetta Campione version, on which they were evidently based, save for being drawn more correctly though with less vigour; virtually the only specifiable difference of detail is that the Hermit (12), who in both packs is an aged friar with a crutch, holds an hour-glass in the Concetta Campione pack instead of the oil lamp which he holds in the Modiano one. As also remarked, the Murari designs are said to have been somewhat dissimilar, though, not having seen a Murari pack, I cannot say in which respects. That the difference cannot have been great, however, is apparent from two nineteenth-century Tarocco Siciliano packs in the collection of Signor Vito Arienti. These two packs, which are identical and were almost certainly made in Sicily, bear on their backs the inscription LA FORTUNA and a design of a woman standing on a wheel (a familiar representation of Fortune), this being the trade-name and sign of the maker, after the fashion common for Italian cardmakers from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Both packs are of 62 cards only, lacking both the Ace and the 4 of Coins; despite the coincidence, I am strongly inclined to believe that they must originally have contained 63 cards, including the 4 of Coins but not the Ace, for reasons that will become apparent. The designs are remarkably similar to those of the Concetta Campione pack, and are probably to be dated to the period 1820-40, the packs themselves having been made at any time between 1820 and 1860. The principal differences are as follows. The beggar on the Miseria is not chained to his block; trump 2 shows a seated moustached King in place of the

Empress; the Chariot (9) is seen from the front instead of in a three-quarters view; the Globe (19) is covered with stars; and the designs on trumps 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are laterally reversed. There are minor differences in the court cards, and the Coins all bear faces; the numeral cards carry the same indices, this time with the initial letter of the suit-name preceding the numeral.

There are also a number of surviving packs, of an older type of design, together with some wood blocks for printing them. The Archivio di Stato in Palermo has four sheets of impressions made on 12 December 1838 from wood blocks made for printing *tarocchi siciliani*; these are in three rows of eight cards each, and comprise altogether 63 distinct cards, including the 4 but not the Ace of Coins, with many repetitions.[1] The Museo Pitré has a pair of actual wood blocks, with three rows of seven cards each: evidently three such blocks, would have printed a complete pack of 63 cards. Most Sicilian Tarot games, as now played, require a pack of 63 cards only. At Calatafimi, the Ace to 3 of the Coins suit and the Ace to 4 of the other three suits are discarded from the Tarocco Piemontese pack. At Tortorici, the Ace of Coins is discarded from the Tarocco Siciliano pack to reduce it to 63 cards. At Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto, on the other hand, the four-handed game is played with all 64 cards of the modern pack; for the three-handed game, the 4 of Coins rather than the Ace is discarded. The players at Barcellona themselves testify, however, that the game was introduced into that town relatively recently; those at Calatafimi who remember the time when the game was played there with the Tarocco Siciliano pack say that the Ace was never used in play, and was introduced only to bear the tax stamp. This, as we shall see, is confirmed by the oldest source we have relating to Tarocchi as played in Sicily, which states that the pack was shortened by the omission of the lowest numeral cards. From 1862 until 1975, all playing cards sold in Italy were subject to a Government tax, and it was the custom, in Latin-suited packs, for the Ace of Coins to be printed as an empty circle in the middle of which the tax stamp was imprinted. It thus seems likely that the Ace of Coins was not introduced into the Tarocco Siciliano pack until 1862, when it was added for the express purpose of bearing the tax stamp; the fact that nowadays the players at Barcellona have come to use it in actual play forms no objection to this hypothesis. The Ace of Coins, in the present Tarocco Siciliano pack, is exactly like that in the regular Sicilian pack; but, on the present hypothesis, the fact that it has no resemblance to the Ace of Coins of the Portuguese-suited pack is sufficiently explained by its having been added to the Tarocco pack at a time when all memory of the regular Portuguese-suited pack had vanished. It is, of course, possible that the Fortuna packs in Signor Arienti's collection represent a fashion, in some part of nineteenth-century Sicily, for playing with only 62 cards; but there is no other evidence of any such fashion, and it is more likely that the 4 of Coins has simply been lost from each of these packs.

The impressions taken from wood blocks in the Archivio di Stato were not made by a cardmaker, but, evidently, simply for antiquarian interest, being one of a set of three, the other two being regular packs stated to be used for the games of Tresette and of Bassetta. Thus by 1838 the older type of Tarocco pack had already become a curiosity, presumably having been replaced by one of the newer type represented by the Fortuna pack. Besides the two wood blocks,[2] which together contain the *Fuggitivo* and all twenty-one trumps, the Museo Pitré also has an uncut and uncoloured sheet of numeral cards which tallies exactly in composition and in the design of the cards, though not precisely in their disposition on the sheet, with the third sheet of impressions in the Archivio di Stato. It also has a nearly complete pack (fifty-four cards out of sixty-three) of actual cards;[3] it is lacking the lowest, unnumbered, trump (the Miseria of the modern pack), trumps 2, 5 and 7, the *Cavallo* of Cups and the *Cavallo*, *Donna*, 8 and 7 of Swords. There is also an extra card, giving the maker's name and address as Felice Cimino, 38 Piano dei Cartari (Palermo). The 10 of Cups bears the date, 1802, and the 7 of Cups bears the initials F C. The backs, which are double-headed, show a bird holding in its claw a shield with the initials F C. The Archivio impressions show the maker's name on the 6 of Cups, and this, though difficult to read, appears to be F. CIMINO; the 7 of Cups again bears the initials FC, while the 10 of Cups bears a date which, although again hard to read, appears to be 1805. The uncut sheet at the Museo Pitré is arranged, like the Archivio impressions, in three rows of eight cards, of which, as on the third Archivio sheet, the bottom one is a repetition of the top one; it includes the 7 of Cups, which again bears the initials FC, and the 10 of Cups, which this time has no date, but not the 6 of Cups. The Museo Pitré pack, the uncut sheet at the Pitré and the Archivio impressions are all, therefore, to be ascribed to Felice Cimino of Palermo, and were printed from three different, but extremely similar, sets of blocks. The wood blocks at the Museo Pitré, on the other hand, have a number of differences in design, and are plainly by a different cardmaker. Finally, a set of Sicilian *tarocchi*, comprising a complete suit of Coins (that is, with the 4 but without the Ace, 2 or 3), the *Fuggitivo* and a complete set of trumps, was sold in London in 1977 and is now in the collection of Miss Sylvia Mann; the 10 of Coins gives the maker's name as Tuzzolino. The backs show an abstract design with a lozenge inside an oval wreath. A regular Sicilian pack sold at the same time also gives the name Tuzzolino on the 6 of Cups, while the Ace of Coins carries the trade-name il Camello.

---

[1] Catalogue number Miscellanea Archivistica No. 225/I.

[2] Catalogue numbers 3479 and 3480.

[3] Catalogue number 3508.

The packs of this earlier type show only very minor differences from one another; in detail after detail they agree, showing that they exemplify a very closely circumscribed standard pattern, subsequently replaced by the somewhat modified designs of which the Fortuna packs are the first known examples and to which the Concetta Campione and Modiano versions essentially conform. The earlier packs have a stylistic resemblance to the commonest type of eighteenth-century Minchiate cards, with the same rather coarse drawing and the same blotchy colouring; like them, and like the great majority of Italian cards until the nineteenth century, the backs are folded over to form borders for the faces of the cards. The composition of the trump sequence is the same as in the later packs, but there are many noteworthy differences of design. The numerals are Roman instead of Arabic. The lowest, unnumbered, trump is inscribed LA POVERTA (Poverty) instead of MISERIA; there is no block on the ground, and the beggar holds, instead of a begging-bowl, a box inscribed INI. Trump II is an Empress, as in the modern pack; the moustached King of the Fortuna pack seems to have been an inexplicable aberration. The pennant on trump IV (more exactly, IIII) is inscribed LA COSTANZA; without this, we should not have been able to identify this figure with certainty. The Chariot (IX, or rather VIIII) is seen from the side. The Hanged Man (XI) is still hanged by the neck, but from a gallows rather than a tree; there are buildings in the background. The Hermit (XII) holds an hourglass; the lamp is an innovation by Modiano. The Globe (XIX or XVIIII) is covered with stars, as in the Fortuna pack. Trump XX is inscribed GIOVE, and differs markedly from the later version. Jupiter rides on his eagle over a city; with his right arm he embraces a youth, presumably Ganymede, whose right arm is upraised; his left arm is lowered, and in his left hand he holds something which may or may not be a thunderbolt. In all the principal respects not here mentioned, the details are the same as in the modern pack, for instance the figures on the XVI, XVII and XVIII (Star, Moon and Sun).

The *Fuggitivo* is much as in the modern pack; as in it, he wears a fool's cap, and is blowing a trumpet and carrying a ball. The suit cards differ in many respects from their modern counterparts, and clinch the characterisation of the Tarocco Siciliano as Portuguese-suited. The most striking feature of this kind is that the *Donne* of Swords and Batons are both being attacked by beasts of some sort (apparently a serpent and a dog respectively); each holds her Sword or her Baton over her right shoulder and is evidently about to strike her attacker with it. On the modern cards, these ladies still hold their weapons upon their right shoulders, but no longer have an aggressive stance, the attacking beasts having disappeared. This curious detail of design is extremely common in Portuguese-suited packs, especially early ones. In this early type of Tarocco Siciliano pack, all the court figures hold their suit-signs in their hands, which remains true in the modern pack, but is not true of the King and Queen of Cups or of any of the court figures in Coins in the Fortuna pack. The Batons in the early packs (though not in the coloured Cimino pack) mostly have a dog's head design on their handles; they are more formalised than the Spanish-style cudgels of the later packs, and resemble stout walking sticks. The dog's head design also appears on the hilts of some of the Swords; but a few of the Batons have a human face instead. The Cups are of an oval shape, much closer to the very rounded Cups of

Portuguese packs than to those of Spanish ones. In the Cimino packs, the Coins are simply two concentric circles; in those of the two wood blocks at the Museo Pitré the inner circle contains five small ones arranged in the shape of a cross, giving the whole thing the appearance of a button; in the Tuzzolino pack there is a small central circle with four spokes radiating from it, so that the Coins still look very like buttons. In all the early packs, the suit cards have indices, of the same kind as in the later ones, save that D (for *Denari*) replaces O (for *Oro*) in the Coins suit. However, the court cards have indices as well as the numeral cards – R for King (*Re*), C for *Cavallo* and D for *Donna*. The interesting fact here is that, in all the packs, indices are lacking on the Queen and on the 10. This suggests very strongly that the designs have been taken over from some Portuguese-suited regular pack, though not from one made in or for Portugal, since those did not have indices. A regular pack would not, of course, have had a Queen; and if, as with most, though not quite all, Portuguese-suited packs, it had only 48 instead of 52 cards, it would lack the 10s as well. In the early packs, the figure of Constancy (trump IV) and many of the court figures hold shields with human faces on them, as they still do in the modern packs.

Although we have no firm dates for any of these packs save 1802 and 1805, it seems quite certain that the standard pattern which they exemplify, or, rather, the style in which it is executed, is characteristic of the eighteenth century, and could be even earlier. In these cards, therefore, we probably see what Sicilian Tarot cards were like throughout the eighteenth century: very likely the pattern was established at about the beginning of that century, and changed not at all until it was replaced by the later type. At the present time, the game appears to be confined to the three towns already mentioned. Elsewhere in Sicily, nobody has heard of it: at a shop in Palermo that specialises in selling playing cards of every possible variety, I was informed that there was no such thing as a Tarocco Siciliano pack. But there are some indications that at the beginning of this century it was much more widespread: the players at Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto say that the game was introduced to their town in the early years of the century by professional card sharps from Palermo, who originally made a lot of money out of the inhabitants of Barcellona until they refused to play with them any more. Apart from the few surviving packs, we have no evidence how popular or well known the game was during the nineteenth century. In the eighteenth century, however, it was evidently quite well known. The Museo Pitré possesses a copy of an edict issued in 1736 by Don Pietro de Castro, who was Presidente del Regno from 1735 to 1737. This edict forbids altogether the playing of certain named gambling games, whether in public or in private, and allows the playing of others in private only; among the latter is the game of Tarocchi, when played *per semplice divertimento* (for amusement only). More detailed information is to be found in one of the *Opusculi* of Emanuele, Marchese di Villabianca (1720-1802), which are preserved in manuscript form in the Biblioteca Comunale in Palermo.[4] Villabianca occupied the later part of his life in writing voluminous notes on every aspect of Sicilian life, history, economic affairs and customs; these notes, which are well known to historians of Sicily but have been only partially published, are contained in a score of manuscript volumes. Among the unpublished sections is one on games which contains several pages on Tarocchi. Villabianca states categorically that the games of Tarocchi and of Gallerini were introduced into Sicily from Italy by Francesco Gaetani, Duke of Sermoneta, in 1663. Gaetani was Viceroy from 1663 to 1664. *Gallerini*, Villabianca explains, is the name used in Sicily for the game elsewhere called Minchiate, a word impossible to use politely in Sicily because of its obscene meaning. Villabianca offers no evidence for his statement about when the Tarot pack reached Sicily, but I see not the slightest reason to disbelieve it. Villabianca, who was probably writing in the 1790s, says that the game of Gallerini has now become almost forgotten in Sicily, and that the cards have therefore become great rarities, although he himself used to play it in his youth. Tarocchi, on the other hand, he writes of as a game still popular, although he himself had not played it since his eyesight became impaired in 1766. He first mentions three types of four-handed game: he then says, 'Giocandosi indi in trè sichiama Giuoco di tarocchini riformato di tarocchi, perche vi si lasciano alcune carte degli ultimi punti' ('It is, further, played as a three-handed game; this is called the game of Tarocchini, modified from Tarocchi, because they leave aside some of the lowest-numbered cards'). That is to say, the pack was shortened by the omission of the lowest numeral cards from each suit in order to play the three-handed game; presumably, therefore, at least up to 1766, the four-handed games were still played with a full 78-card pack. The use of the term Tarocchini does not indicate any connection with the Bolognese game: it was, surely, simply an expression for a game played with a shortened Tarot pack. Evidently, the cards omitted were the Ace to 3 of Coins and the Ace to 4 of the other three suits. We thus have an explanation for the shortening of the pack: the three-handed game must for a time have gained such an ascendancy over the four-handed ones that cardmakers found it worth while to produce shortened packs, and this lasted for so long that the full 78-card pack was forgotten. It is apparent that Villabianca was writing from a rather hazy memory of the game he had played when his eyesight was still good, and the full pack may well already have disappeared by the time he was writing. He says vaguely that, of the twenty-two extra cards, the most notable are the *Giove*, the *Povertà*, the *Picciotti* and the *Fuggitivo*. This gives us not only the relatively unimportant information that the Sicilian terms *Picciotti* and *Fuggitivo* go back to the eighteenth century, but the more important information that, presumably at least from the time of Villabianca's youth, the pack already contained the unnumbered *Povertà*, the equivalent of the modern *Miseria*, and that the highest trump already depicted Jupiter. Villabianca does, however, explain one peculiarity of the Sicilian Tarot pack. In a passage that is extremely hard to read, especially because the edge of the page is somewhat frayed, he tells us that at the time of his youth the cards included the figure of the Devil (*il Demonio*) and also one he describes by a phrase beginning *novissimo dell'* …, the end of which cannot be read. These, however, gave offence of some kind to the players, and so they were eliminated and replaced by the figure of the Ship (*il Vascello*) and the Tower (*la Torre*); he mentions Magda Rosalia, Duchess of Caccamo, as having been concerned in effecting this substitution.[5] The Ship (14) occupies the exact place in the sequence where we should expect, from other Tarot packs, to find the Devil, namely between Death (13) and the Tower (15), and we here have testimony to the pack's having originally contained the Devil at just that place; the subject substituted for it was evidently chosen arbitrarily from the Minchiate pack. The remark about the Tower, apart from being partly illegible, is more puzzling, since the Tower is of course one of the standard subjects, and comes just where we should expect to find it. Probably it originally represented the corresponding subject in the Minchiate pack (XV), being called, like it, the House of the Devil or something similar, and was later converted into a harmless tower without any further significance. I have not been able to discover the date of the Duchess Magda Rosalia; but presumably the substitutions were made in about 1740.

---

[4] *Opusculi* del Marchese de Villabianca tomo XVIII, opusc. 2, section 2, pp. 31, 91-100: shelf mark Q_Q E94.

I have reviewed all the direct evidence concerning the history of the Tarocco Siciliano pack of which I am aware, and we now have to seek, on the basis of it, an explanation of those features of the pack which remain puzzling. These are of two kinds: the use of the Portuguese suit-system; and the composition of the pack. From Villabianca's account, the Tarot pack entered Sicily in 1663 in what must then have been a standard 78-card form as used in mainland Italy; we have to decide how many of its peculiarities were already present when it arrived and how many developed in Sicily after its arrival. This is not easy to do, since we know so little of seventeenth-century Italian Tarot packs. Villabianca indicates three respects in which its special features developed within Sicily: the reduction of the pack to 63 cards; the replacement of the Devil by the Ship; and the intact Tower. What about the rest?

---

[5] The best transcription of this passage which I can achieve is as follows. 'A tempi della mia età Villabianca rappresentavasi in queste Carte di Tarocchi le figure del Demonio, e del novissimo dell' … ma perchè questi davan (?) piùtosto motivi di $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{mistella (?)}\\ \text{misretta (?)}\end{matrix}\right\}$ ai Giuocatori che d'a … pcio (?) fur° aboliti, e cambiati nelle figure del Vascello, e della Torre aspege (?) d… Duchessa Magda Rosalia Caccamo, chè nè li (?) fare appostar (?) speure (?) i …'. The handwriting is sometimes difficult, and the edge of the page is frayed. The phrase 'pcio fur°' is presumably an abbreviation for 'perciò furono'. The opening expression 'A tempi della mia età Villabianca' is obscure to me; Villabianca often inserts his own name when he refers to himself, and the first five words mean literally 'In the times of my age', *età* meaning 'age' neutrally, not with the connotation 'old age' that it often bears in English. I take it to mean 'in the time of my youth'. Obviously most of the question marks indicate misreadings. As best I can translate it, the passage runs: 'In the time of my youth there were represented on these Tarot cards the figures of the Devil and of the last of …; but because these gave feelings of … to the players who …, they were therefore eliminated, and converted into the figures of the Ship and of the Tower … Duchess Magda Rosalia Caccamo, who … to make of them specially …' Despite the obscurities, the general sense comes through.

Jupiter, as trump 20, is obviously a replacement for the Angel of other packs, as Atlas (19) is a replacement for the World; these two replacements seem to represent a classicising tendency. As the Angel hovers over a city in the Minchiate pack, so Jupiter hovers over a city in the older type of Tarocco Siciliano pack, though he no longer does so in the modern version. As explained in Chapter 20, among the few seventeenth-century Italian Tarot packs that we have are those made by the cardmaker using the trade-name Orfeo, which for the most part employ Minchiate designs; if a replacement for an Angel of the Minchiate type were wanted, Jupiter on his eagle might seem a very natural one. As for why it should be wanted, it will also be recalled that when, in an effort to save face, the Papal authorities in 1725 withdrew their prosecution of Canon Montieri on condition that the *Papi* were replaced by Moors in the Bolognese pack, they also demanded that the Angel be replaced by a Lady, a demand that was not complied with. We thus know that some ecclesiastics regarded, or at least affected to regard, the inclusion of the angel of the Last Judgment in a pack of playing cards as savouring of the blasphemous. There may, in the seventeenth century, have been some Sicilian prelate who felt the same way, and who could order the replacement of the Angel by a pagan god as the Duchess of Caccamo ordered the replacement of the Devil by a sailing ship. More likely the form of Tarot pack that entered Sicily in 1663 came from Rome, and already contained Jupiter and Atlas in place of the Angel and the World as a means of avoiding offence to church authorities.

The other peculiarity of the trump sequence is more perplexing. It is no surprise that the Tarocco Siciliano contains no Pope or Popess; I have already remarked earlier that perhaps by the end of the seventeenth century no Italian Tarot packs save the Bolognese one contained them. The introduction of Constancy to make up for the absence of one of them is likewise no great surprise; although not one of the cardinal Virtues, she sometimes appears in sculpture or painting when an additional Virtue is needed for the sake of the composition. What remains extraordinary is that the omission of the other member of the Papal pair should have been redressed by the inclusion, not merely of so surprising a subject as Poverty, but of a card ranking below the Bagatto. However this happened, I am disposed to think that it happened before the pack arrived in Sicily. In the seventeenth century, as just noted, the Florentine cardmaker 'Orfeo' produced what appear to have been 78-card Tarocco packs in which Minchiate designs are used for most of the cards. There is therefore no reason to assume that the stylistic resemblance between the older type of Tarocco Siciliano pack and the Minchiate pack was a Sicilian development: probably the Tarot pack that came to Sicily in 1663 was already very similar in style to the Minchiate pack. It cannot actually have been an Orfeo pack, since the order of the Hermit and the Hanged Man, and, again, of the Chariot and the Wheel, is reversed; but it must have been something very similar. Now there is a puzzle about the Orfeo packs, in that none of the known surviving examples contains the nine lowest trumps, and, further, that while nine trumps are needed to make up the total to twenty-one, only the numbers I to VIII remain unassigned. One solution would be that the pack still contained the Pope and Popess, and that the Bagatto was unnumbered. But another possible solution would be that the trump subjects from I to VIII were as in the Minchiate pack, and that a further subject, like the Sicilian *Povertà* or *Miseria*, ranked below the Bagatto. We have too little evidence to make prolonged speculation profitable; but it is at least a possibility that the arrangement of the nine lowest trumps in the Tarocco Siciliano, from the *Povertà* to Love (8), is not of Sicilian origin, but represents one type of seventeenth-century Italian Tarot pack.

That leaves the question of the use of the Portuguese suit-system. Was the Tarot pack introduced into Sicily in 1663 a Portuguese-suited one, or was the pack converted from the Italian to the Portuguese suit-system after its arrival in Sicily? There is evidence for both solutions. One of the few Italian Tarot packs to have survived to us from the seventeenth century is one made by a cardmaker who used the trade-name 'alla Colonna'. Of this we have two fragmentary sheets, made in Rome and employing a fully-fledged Portuguese suit-system, very similar to a regular pack by the same maker dated 1613. This pack cannot be the immediate ancestor of the Tarocco Siciliano, since the trumps are numbered from 1 to 21 (in Arabic numerals) and the order of trumps is different, Love being numbered 6 and presumably being followed by the three cardinal Virtues, since the Chariot is numbered 10 and the Wheel 11. It nevertheless shows that Portuguese-suited Tarot packs, complete with indices at top and bottom, were known in Rome half a century before the pack was introduced into Sicily. On the other hand, regular Portuguese-suited packs were also known in Sicily before the Tarot pack was introduced. The earliest surviving Portuguese-suited pack with dragons on the Aces made in Europe is one made by Pietro Ciliberto in 1597 in the collection of Miss Sylvia Mann, although the pack was certainly in existence a good deal earlier, since before that date the Japanese were producing packs based on prototypes brought by Portuguese sailors. Ciliberto is certainly not a Portuguese or Spanish name, but an Italian one, and there are people of that name in Palermo today; Miss Mann has made the very plausible suggestion that Pietro Ciliberto was a Sicilian cardmaker. His pack does not have indices, but the Kings are seated, the Maid of Batons is about to club a dog that is attacking her, the King of Batons and the *Cavallo* of Swords have shields with faces, and the Swords have something like a dog's head design on their hilts. The Ace of Swords bears the Spanish royal coat of arms. In the Museo Pitré there is an incomplete regular Portuguese-suited pack dated 1639, the cards having been cut from the sheet but left uncoloured.[6] This pack was almost certainly made in Sicily, since the Museo Pitré contains only objects of Sicilian origin. There are only eight cards, all with indices in rectangles at top and bottom, the letter D being used for the Coins suit. In the Swords suit there are the *Cavallo* and the 7, the latter with straight intersecting swords with dog's head designs on the hilts. The Batons suit has a seated King and the 6; the Batons are of an angular shape similar to those on the alla Colonna cards. In Cups there are the 7 and the 4, the latter bearing the date 1639; the Cups are elaborate and very rounded. In Coins there are the 7 and the Ace, the latter with a dragon holding the Coin in its mouth.

It is also worth mentioning in this connection the celebrated Portuguese-suited pack made in 1692 for Malta by the Spanish cardmaker A. Infirerra, whose name appears on the 4 of Cups, the date being on the 2 of Coins. These cards too bear indices, D being used for the Coins suit and also for the *Donne* (which bear the initial F for *Fantiglia* or *Fantina* in the alla Colonna packs). According to the illustrated catalogue of the Lady Schreiber collection, the shield on the 4 of Coins is that of Adrien de Vignacourt, Grand Master of Malta from 1690 to 1697; the four Kings all bear Maltese crosses upon their breasts.[7]

As far back as we can trace, and probably from the beginning of Spanish rule, most Sicilian regular packs have been Spanish-suited. But these examples show that the Portuguese-suited pack was known in Sicily from well before the Tarot pack was introduced. It even appears to have had there a feature peculiar to Sicily, the dog's head design on Batons and Swords. We should not allow this fact to prompt us to enquire how Portuguese influence came to make itself felt in Sicily: Portuguese influence was not necessary for this result. The early history of the Portuguese-suited pack in Europe remains obscure. But I have already suggested that it should be regarded, not as Portuguese, but as Spanish, or, specifically, Catalan, in origin, though not, at that stage, having yet acquired the dragons on the Aces. On this hypothesis, it was the suit-system used in Spain down to the early sixteenth century, thereafter banished to Portugal when it was supplanted in Spain by the 'Spanish' suit-system, itself originally the French version of the Latin system, and largely replaced in France by the French suits. It is tempting to suppose that the dragon Aces really were a specifically Portuguese addition to the pack, dragons being the supporters of the Portuguese royal coat of arms. But, since dragons appear on the Aces in many Portuguese-suited packs made outside Portugal in areas free of Portuguese influence, this is probably not so. If this general hypothesis is correct, the 'Portuguese-suited' pack could have reached Sicily at any time during the period of Aragonese rule, which lasted until 1458.

---

[6] Catalogue number G.E. 3180.

[7] *Playing Cards of Various Ages and Countries: Selected from the Collection of Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, vol. III, London, 1895, notes to Plate 44.

It does not seem likely, however, that the Tarot pack reached Sicily in an Italian-suited form and was there converted to a Portuguese-suited one. By the later seventeenth century, the regular Portuguese-suited pack must have become a rarity, largely ousted by the Spanish-suited one, and not, therefore, a mode vigorous enough to have imposed itself upon a new type of pack. Rather, the probability is that the Tarot pack was introduced into Sicily in a Portuguese-suited form from Rome or Florence (not from Naples, where Tarot has never flourished), and, when once introduced, took on some of the special features of that suit-system as already known in Sicily, such as the dog's head handles and the shields with faces. (Shields with faces appear on some numeral cards in actual Portuguese packs; the distinctive feature of Sicilian ones is that they are borne by court figures.) If these conclusions are right, then the Sicilian Tarot pack, at least in its older form, is to a large extent a coelocanth, preserving the features of some seventeenth-century type of Italian pack that has otherwise long vanished without trace.

I have discussed the Tarocco Siciliano cards at some length because they have hardly been studied and are not discussed or even described in the literature: it is now time to turn to the games played with them.

The Sicilian game of Tarocchi has never, in the course of its history, been described in print; indeed, in no book that I have ever seen is it so much as mentioned that there is such a game. The following accounts are based on information given to me by players at Calatafimi and at Barcellona Pozzi di Gotto and Tortorici during two visits to Sicily in 1972 and 1973. I have tried hard to avoid inaccuracies, and hope that I have succeeded. There are certain basic rules common to all forms of the game, which I begin by setting out. I have described the game played at Calatafimi as if played with the Tarocco Siciliano pack, as it used to be, although it is now played with the Tarocco Piemontese. When the Tarocco Piemontese is used, the *Fante* (Jack) of each suit replaces the *Donna* (Maid), the XXI replaces the *Giove* (20), the XX, XIX, XVIII and XVII replace, respectively, the *Palla* (19), *Sole* (18), *Luna* (17) and *Stella* (16), the II replaces the *Picciotti* (1) and the I replaces the *Miseria*.

Basic Rules of Sicilian Tarocchi

Ranking and values of the cards

Usually, only 63 cards are used, although there is one form in which all 64 cards are in play. The Coins suit is called *Oro* or, sometimes, *Denari*, and, when only 63 cards are used, the reduction is effected by the omission of the Ace of this suit, or, less frequently, of the 4. In all four suits, the cards rank, in descending order:

Re, *Regina*, *Cavallo*, *Donna*, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, (4), (Ace).

The trumps are called *trionfi*, *briscole* or *numeri*. The 20 is called *Giove*. At Calatafimi the 19 is called *la Palla*, at Barcellona and Tortorici it is called *la Balla* or *l'Atlante*. The 18, 17 and 16 are called, respectively, *il Sole*, *la Luna* and *la Stella*. At Calatafimi the 1 is called *i Picciotti*, at Barcellona and Tortorici *i Bagotti*. Apart from the *Miseria*, the other trumps are referred to by number. The *Miseria* ranks as the lowest trump, being beaten by all others. The remaining trumps rank in numerical sequence, the *Giove* (20) being the highest and the *Picciotti* (1) being the lowest (other than the *Miseria*). The Fool is called *il Fuggitivo* (or sometimes at Tortorici *il Matto*), and serves as Excuse. The values of the counting cards are as follows:

The *Giove* (20)	10 points
The *Picciotti* (1)	10 points
The *Fuggitivo*	10 points
The *Palla* (19)	5 points
The *Sole* (18)	5 points
The *Luna* (17)	5 points
The *Stella* (16)	5 points
Each King	5 points
Each Queen	4 points
Each *Cavallo*	3 points
Each *Donna*	2 points

Whatever the number of players, the cards are counted in threes. Two odd low cards count 1 point, a single odd low card counts nothing. There are 5 points for winning the last trick. There are thus always 109 points in the game altogether. (When all 64 cards are used, two odd low cards count ½ point.) The *Giove*, *Picciotti* and *Fuggitivo* are called collectively *diecine* (or *decine*). The top five trumps, from the *Stella* (16) to the *Giove* (20), are called *arie*: the cards worth 5 points each, namely the four Kings and the trumps from 16 to 19 inclusive, are called *cinquine*.

Discard

A player who has taken additional cards must discard an equal number to reduce his hand to the same length as the other players'. He places the discarded cards face down beside him on the table. He may never discard Kings, *arie*, the *Picciotti* or the *Fuggitivo*; he may, however, discard court cards lower than the King. He may not discard trumps unless he is obliged to in order to comply with the other restrictions, and then only as many as necessary in order to do so, but does not then need to announce the fact. The discarded cards count to him or to his side at the end of the round.

Play

Deal and play are counter-clockwise. Play is under the usual rules. The player who holds the *Fuggitivo* may play it at any time. He does not play it to the centre of the table, but simply places it face down on top of the cards he has won in tricks; he does not give another card in exchange for it. If he has so far won no trick, or, when he has a partner, if his side has so far won no trick, he places the *Fuggitivo* face up beside him; as soon as he or his side wins a trick, he places it face down on top of the cards of that trick. If he or his side wins no trick, however, he has to surrender the *Fuggitivo* at the end of the round to the player or side that won the trick to which he played it. It is not allowed to play the *Fuggitivo* as the first card of any trick, save, perforce, in the last trick; in the latter case, the trick is won by the highest trump played, or, if there is no trump, by the highest card of the suit to which the card played by the second player belongs.

It will be recalled that, according to Villabianca, the full 78-card pack was originally used for the four-handed game, and the shortened 63-card pack for the three-handed one; and I commented that the disappearance of the full pack testifies to a period when the three-handed game was predominant. This is confirmed by the practice of counting the cards in threes. Three-handed forms still predominate in the province of Messina, at Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto and at Tortorici, and we may begin with these.

Three-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Tortorici version)

A 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. The dealer gives twenty cards to each player in five rounds of four cards each, starting with the player to his right. He places the last three cards face down on the table to form the *monte*. The player to the right of the dealer opens the bidding. There are only two positive bids, *Chiamo* ('I call') and *Vado solo* ('I go alone'). Since it is never to the advantage of the first player to pass or to say *Solo* straight away, he always opens by saying *Chiamo*. The second player may now either pass, which he does by saying *Bene* ('Good'), or overbid by saying *Vado solo*; if he passes, the dealer has the same choice. If either of the two other players says *Vado solo*, the first player may claim the prior right to play a Solo by saying *Solo io*. If both pass, he may, if he wishes, announce a Solo.

In either case, the declarer (successful bidder) takes the three cards of the *monte* into his hand and discards three, which count for him at the end of the round. If a *chiamata* is being played, that is, if the declarer said only *Chiamo*, each of the three players plays for himself. The player to the right of the declarer leads to the first trick, and each player keeps beside him on the table the cards he wins in tricks. At the end of the round, each computes the points he has won, including the 5 points for the last trick. If the declarer has gained more than 37 points, he marks, as a positive score, as many game points as he has points in excess of 37; if he has less than 37 points, he marks the difference as a negative score; if he has exactly 37 points, he has a null score. Each of the other two players likewise marks, as a positive or negative score, the excess of his point-total over, or its difference from, 36 points.

If a Solo (*solità*) is being played, the two other players unite in a temporary partnership against the declarer. In this case the declarer leads to the first trick, and the two opponents keep together the cards they win in tricks. If the declarer makes more than 55 points, he marks, as a positive score, *twice* as many game points as he has points in excess of 55; if he has less than 55 points, he marks twice the difference as a negative score; and if he has exactly 55 points, he has a null score. If the declarer has made more than 55 points, each opponent marks, as a negative score, the difference between their combined point-total and 54 points; if he has made less than 55 points, each marks the excess of their combined point-total over 54 points as a positive score; if he has made exactly 55 points, they will have made exactly 54, and their score is also null.

When the players have played as many rounds as they choose, each player receives or pays, in all, the amount of his final score, according as it is positive or negative.

At nearby Barcellona Pozzo di Gotto, the game is played in a slightly different way, the principal difference lying in the fact that the Tortorici game is played in silence, while at Barcellona the opponents of a Solo player may give each other information about important cards in their possession.

Three-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Barcellona version)

All is as in the preceding game, with the following exceptions. The 4 of Coins is omitted instead of the Ace (this of course makes no difference to the play). In the bidding, each of the first two players must either say *Vado solo* or pass; if both pass, the dealer cannot say *Vado solo*, but has the option of either taking the three cards of the *monte*, and thus in effect becoming the declarer in a *chiamata*, or of throwing in his hand, in which case the deal is annulled and there is a new deal by the next dealer.

When a Solo is played, if one of the two opponents has the *Giove* and one or more of the other *arie*, he may, when he has the lead, announce the fact by means of certain conventional expressions. If he has the *Giove* and either the *Palla* (19) or the *Sole* (18), he says *Batto* ('I strike'); if he has the *Giove* and any two of the next three *arie*, he says *Batto forte* ('I strike hard'); if he has the *Giove* and three other *arie*, he says *Sfondo* ('I break'); and if he has all five *arie*, he says *Sfondo i tavoli* ('I break the tables').

At Calatafimi, a three-handed game is also played, but the principal form is a four-handed one, of considerable complexity; this will be described next.

Four-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Calatafimi version)

Deal

A 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. Before dealing, the dealer may look at the bottom card of the pack; he then starts by giving ten cards to each player, in two rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player to his right. Eventually, each will receive fifteen cards, but there is first a pause for bargaining, called *pattegiare*, on the basis of the first ten cards dealt to each player. This bargaining determines whether or not the deal will continue, or whether the hands will be thrown in for a fresh deal. The players do not speak in any determinate order. The first to speak will be any player who thinks he has a poor hand, as far as he can judge from the ten cards so far dealt to him. Such a player will offer a number of game points to abandon the play on that deal; normally, the maximum offer is of 8 game points, or, in extreme cases, 10. A player with a strong hand waits to hear what offers will be made. If all the other three players have spoken, he can choose to say either '*Tengo*' ('I hold') or '*Prendo*' ('I take'). He says '*Tengo*' if the offers made are not together sufficient to induce him to abandon the deal; in this case, the offers become void, and the dealer resumes the deal, giving five more cards to each player in a single round. If he says '*Prendo*', the deal is abandoned, and he is credited with a positive score equal to the sum of the offers, while those who made offers mark negative scores equal to their offers; there is then a new deal by the *same* dealer. A player with a middling hand, who does not wish to make an offer, but is willing to abandon the deal without payment, says '*Mescolate*' ('Shuffle'), or, if he is the dealer, '*Mescolo*' ('I shuffle'). For instance, player A offers 8 game points, player B says '*Mescolate*' and player C offers 2 game points; if player D says '*Prendo*', there is a new deal, with A marking −8 game points, B nothing, C −2 game points and D +10 game points.

If only two players, or only one, has made an offer or said '*Mescolate*' the remaining players may state their willingness to abandon the deal for a limited payment. For instance, player A offers 7 game points and player C offers 4; if player B now states that he will accept 6 game points to abandon the deal, D may either force the continuation of the deal by saying '*Tengo*' or, by saying '*Prendo*', agree to its abandonment for the remaining 5 game points: A marks −7 game points, B +6, C −4 and D +5. In this process, no player may speak more than once; having made an offer, for example, he cannot later improve it. The bargaining ends when all have spoken or as soon as any player says '*Tengo*'; but one with a good hand will naturally wait to see what offers the others will make.

Bidding

If any player has said '*Tengo*', the deal is completed and the dealer places the last three cards face down in the centre of the table. He then asks whether any player wishes to play solo; if none does, he may opt to play solo himself. In the unlikely event that more than one player wishes to play solo, the preference goes to the one next in rotation after the dealer. If a player other than the dealer plays solo, he turns the three extra cards face up, and then takes them into his hand and discards three. If the dealer plays solo, he takes the three extra cards without showing them to the others, and discards three. The solo player will play against the other three, who are in temporary partnership against him.

If no player wishes to play solo, the dealer again takes the three extra cards without exposing them and discards three; he may not announce an intention to play solo after having taken the three cards. There is now a kind of bidding procedure to determine the temporary partnerships to be formed for the round. The player to the dealer's right is the first to speak. If he has in his hand counting cards worth 5 or 10 points each (Kings, *arie*, the *Picciotti* or the *Fuggitivo*) whose combined value comes to 20 points or more, he may, but is not obliged to, say 'Twenty'; if he cannot or does not wish to say 'Twenty', he says 'Zero'. If he says 'Zero', the player to his right has the same option. This continues until either some player has said 'Twenty' or all have said 'Zero'. In the latter case, the hands are thrown in and there is a new deal by the same dealer. When a player has said 'Twenty', the bidding continues, but now the options are to say either 'Fifteen' or 'Zero': a player may say 'Fifteen' only if he has *exactly* 15 points on cards worth either 5 or 10 points each; he is not obliged to do so. As soon as any player has said 'Fifteen', the bidding stops: the player who said 'Twenty' and the one who said 'Fifteen' are temporary partners, as are the other two. If, after a player has said 'Twenty', the other three players all say 'Zero', the one who said 'Twenty' now calls a King to determine his partner, who will be the player who holds the called King.

In calling a King, the player who said 'Twenty' must name a King not in his hand. He is obliged to call the King of that suit, among those of which he lacks the Kings, in which he holds the fewest cards. By this is meant the shortest suit in which he actually holds one or more cards: he is not obliged to call the King of a suit in which he is void unless he holds the Kings of all other suits. If he has two equally short suits lacking the King, he must call that in which he has the better court card; if, among two that are equal in this respect, one is Coins, he must call the King of Coins. If he has all four Kings, he must call a Queen. In the latter case, the same restrictions apply, but should probably be interpreted to mean that he calls the shortest of his suits in which he has a card other than the King, but lacks the Queen. The player who has the King or Queen that is called does not announce the fact.

Play

If there is a solo player, the player to his right leads to the first trick. Otherwise, there are two partnerships of two players each, and the lead to the first trick is made by the player to the right of the one who said 'Twenty'. When partners are known, one player on each side keeps the cards won in tricks by himself and his partner; but when a King or Queen was called, each keeps the cards he himself has won until the called card is played. If a King or Queen was called, and is held by the dealer, then, if the dealer obtains the lead before a trick has been played in the suit of the called card, he is bound to lead that suit, though he need not lead the called card; this applies, in particular, if he has the lead to the first trick. A player who holds the *Giove* (20) or *Palla* (19) may, when he has the lead, and before he leads a card, indicate his possession of this card to his partner or partners by knocking on the table and saying '*Giove*' or '*Palla*'. Formerly, he was only allowed to say '*Batto*' without specifying which of the two cards he held; nowadays he may do this if he wishes, but he may also specify. A player who has both the *Giove* and the *Palla* may not announce both at the same time, but he may announce each at different times.

Scoring

Each player keeps his own score. In any one round, there are just two sides. The side that had the advantage of the three additional cards, that is, the solo player if there was one, or otherwise the dealer and his partner, has to make more than 55 points to obtain a positive score: the other side has to make more than 54 points. A solo player who makes more than 55 points marks, as a positive score, three times as many game points as the excess of his point-total over 55; each of his opponents marks, as a negative score, as many game points as their combined point-total fell below 54. Conversely, if a solo player makes less than 55 points, he marks, as a negative score, three times as many game points as his point-total fell short of 55, while each of the three opponents marks as a positive score as many game points as they had points in excess of 54. If the solo player made exactly 55 points, no one scores. If the round was played with two partnerships of two players each, the dealer and his partner each mark the difference, positive or negative, between their point-total and 55, and each of the other two marks the difference, positive or negative, between their point-total and 54.

The play in this extremely skilful game will be in part governed by the knowledge of the strengths of each other's hands which the players have derived from the bargaining and the bidding. Making a good score in an evening's play depends in part on precise judgment how much to offer or to accept in the bargaining. In the bidding, a player's objective will be to avoid becoming the partner of the player who, on the evidence of the bargaining, has the weakest hand.

Although the four-handed game is very much the predominant form at Calatafimi, and is considered that which is suited to really serious players, there are also three-handed and two-handed versions.

Three-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Calatafimi version)

A 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. The dealer gives twenty cards to each player, in four rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player to his right. After the third round of the deal, when each player has fifteen cards, there is a pause for bargaining as in the preceding four-handed game. If the deal is to be resumed, the dealer takes the last three cards for himself, after the fourth round of the deal, and without showing them to the other players; he then discards three cards. There is no bidding, and each player plays for himself in each round. The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. At the end of the round, the dealer marks, as a positive or negative score, the difference between his point-total and 37 points; each of the other two players marks, in the same way, the difference between his point-total and 36 points.

Two-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Calatafimi version)

A 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. The dealer gives twenty cards to each player, in four rounds of five cards each, beginning with his opponent. He then takes three extra cards for himself, and discards three; he places the remaining twenty cards face down in the centre of the table, to form a stock. The opponent of the dealer leads to the first trick. As long as the stock lasts, the winner of each trick draws the top card of the stock and adds it to his hand, while the other player draws the next card. The dealer marks, as a positive or negative score, the difference between his point-total and 55 points; his opponent marks in the same way the difference between his point-total and 54 points.

We may now return to the province of Messina to learn of the four-handed games played there.

Four-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Tortorici version)

A 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. The dealer gives fifteen cards to each player, in three rounds of five each, starting with the player to his right. In the first two rounds of the deal, the dealer may, if he wishes, deal face up any one of the five cards he gives to each player. The players are divided into two fixed partnerships, partners facing each other across the table. After each of the first two rounds of the deal, the player to the dealer's right may, if he wishes, announce to his partner any important cards that he has. If he exercises this right, then the dealer's partner, or, if he does not choose to do so, the dealer himself, may do the same: but the dealer's partner may announce at most two Kings, even if he in fact has three or all four. At the end of the deal, the dealer takes the three remaining cards for himself, without showing them to the other players, and discards three. The player to the right of the dealer leads to the first trick. If the dealer and his partner make more than 55 points, they score, as game points, the excess of their point-total over 55; if the opponents of the dealer make more than 54 points, they score the excess of their point-total over 54. A game (*partita*) is concluded when, in the course of one or more rounds, one side has attained a cumulative total of 50 game points (or, among some players, 51 game points).

Variant form

All 64 cards are used, including both the 4 and Ace of Coins. After the last round of the deal, the dealer does not take the last four cards for himself, but places them face down in the centre of the table. The player to the dealer's right may now either pass or say *Solo*; if he passes, the next player has the same choice, and so on. The first player to say *Solo* exposes the four additional cards, and then adds them to his hand, discarding four: but he still plays in partnership with the player facing him. The player to the right of the one who said *Solo* leads to the first trick. At the end of the round, the player who said *Solo* and his partner score for points they have above 55, or their opponents score for points they have above 54. All else is as before.

Note

The description of the variant form with 64 cards is set out as it was given to me; but, as stated, there can be no motive for the first player to pass, since the draw and discard, guaranteeing 1 point, is pure advantage. Probably, therefore, there should be some disadvantage to bidding, though not strong enough to induce all four players to pass in the normal case. One possibility would be that the declarer and his partner should pay double if they lose; but I have no authority for this suggestion.

At Barcellona, it is rare to play with four active players; normally, when four people sit down together to play Tarocchi, the three-handed game is played, the dealer in each round sitting out as the *morto*. However, a simple four-handed game does exist.

Four-handed Tarocchi (contemporary Barcellona version)

All 64 cards are used, including both the 4 and Ace of Coins. The dealer gives sixteen cards to each player, in four rounds of four cards each, beginning with the player to his right, who leads to the first trick; since no player has any extra cards, there is no discard. The game may be played either with fixed partners, facing each other across the table, or with each of the four players playing for himself. In the former case, the side making the higher point-total scores as game points the difference between it and the opponents' total; in the latter case, each player marks, as a positive or negative score, the difference between his point-total and 27 points.

It seems very likely that the conclusion we arrived at about the Sicilian Tarocco pack is also true of the game, at least as regards the basic rules. All the indications are that Sicilian players have been very conservative; in its essential features, the game has probably not changed very much since its introduction in 1663. In this way there has been preserved one version of the game of Tarocchi as played in Italy in the seventeenth century, a version that died out in mainland Italy at about the end of that century. Probably some of the special features of the game as played at Calatafimi represent a local development; this is almost certainly true of the unparalleled 'Twenty'/'Fifteen' method of bidding (if it can be called 'bidding'), though probably not true of the bargaining procedure. The games now played in the province of Messina, on the other hand, are simplified forms. A more complicated three-handed game called Vanto, now obsolete, used to be played at Tortorici in living memory, and I was fortunate to obtain an account of this form from Avvocato Onorevole Gaetano Franchina, of that town. The following description is not comprehensive, but gives some idea of the more complicated game ancestral to the modern three-handed one.

Vanto

Three players take part, and a 63-card pack is used, omitting the Ace of Coins. Before the first deal, and whenever it is empty, the players contribute equally to a pot (10 game points each might be a suitable contribution). The dealer gives twenty cards to each player, in four rounds of five cards each, beginning with the player to his right. After each of the first three rounds of the deal, the players look at their cards, and each in turn may, if he wishes, declare that he will play *solo*. A player who has declared a *solo* and who has all three *decine* (the *Giove* (20), the *Bagotti* (1) and the *Fuggitivo*) may, after any of the first three rounds of the deal, announce that he will bring home all three; since he cannot fail to bring home the *Giove* and the *Fuggitivo*, this is of course a bet that he will save the *Bagotti*. If anyone has declared *Solo*, he receives the last three cards, and discards three. He may then, if he wishes, announce that he will win the last trick. If no-one has declared a *Solo* by the beginning of the last round of the deal, there is no further opportunity for doing so; when the deal is completed, the player to the dealer's right says *Chiamo*, takes the last three cards and discards three (there is no advantage in passing).

The player who took the three extra cards leads to the first trick. If a *solo* player makes more than 55 points, each of the two opponents pays him as many game points as he has points in excess of 55 if he declared *Solo* after the last round of the deal, twice as many if he declared *Solo* after the second round of the deal, and three times as many if he declared *Solo* after the first round of the deal. Likewise, if he makes less than 55 points, he pays to each opponent the difference of his point-total from 55, twice the difference or three times the difference, according as he declared *Solo* after the third, the second or the first round of the deal. If the *solo* player announced all three *decine*, and has saved the *Bagotti*, each opponent pays him 10, 20 or 30 game points, according as he made the announcement after the third, the second or the first round of the deal. If the *Solo* player announced all three *decine* but lost the *Bagotti*, he pays a similar penalty to each opponent. If the *solo* player announced that he would win the last trick, and succeeded, he takes the pot; but, if he failed, he doubles the pot. If in the course of play the *solo* player captures a King, each opponent pays him 5 game points, and the same applies if he captures an *aria* (the 16, 17, 18 or 19); conversely, if he loses a King or an *aria*, he pays 5 game points to each opponent. If the side that captures a King has, at the end of the round, all four Kings among its tricks, an additional payment of 20 game points is made; similarly, if the side that captured an *aria* has, at the end of the round, all four of the *arie* other than the *Giove* among its tricks, an additional payment of 20 game points is made. A player who has in his hand the *ternone*, that is, the set consisting of the 13, 14 and 15, and who announces this at the moment when he first plays one of them, receives 5 game points from each of the other two players. When no-one has declared *Solo*, the player who said *Chiamo* receives or pays, in all, as many game points as his point-total exceeds or falls short of 37, and each of the other two receives or pays, in all, as many game points as his total exceeds or falls short of 36. In this case, one who loses a King or an *aria* pays 5 game points to the player capturing it.

Although Villabianca is disappointingly uninformative about the details of play, he says enough to confirm that Vanto is of some antiquity. Save for calling the Coins suit *Oremi*, his terminology is strikingly like that of the present day: the names he uses for individual cards have already been mentioned, and he calls trumps in general *trionfi* and the top five *arie*. He tells us that the game of Tarocchi may be played by four players in three ways: as a partnership game, with bidding (*a chiamare*) or with each playing for himself. Then there is the game of Tarocchini for three players, and finally a two-handed game. He goes on to say that special terms used in the game are *Vanto*, *Rivanto* and *Arcirivanto*: *vanto* means 'I boast', and these are evidently announcements of various kinds. Then follow two sentences which leave a rather vague impression, but serve to show that the game in Villabianca's day must have been rather similar to the game of Vanto described to me by Avv. On. Franchina. If I have read Villabianca's handwriting correctly, these sentences run: 'Del vanto coll'Arie, e colla scommessa, fare il vanto colla carta designata, andarvi solo fare tutte le Arie. Scommettere per li quattro Re, e statuirvi altri patti che non sò io mentre più ora non me ne ricordo'. It is difficult to construe these grammatically, but the best rendering I can achieve is: 'Of the *vanto* with the *Arie*, and with the bet to make the *vanto* with the designated card, to go *solo* to make all the *Arie*. To bet on the four Kings, and to undertake other contracts which I do not know because I now no longer remember them.'

Card players of the three Sicilian towns mentioned in this chapter, like those of Bologna and its environs, have preserved ancient traditions that have elsewhere died out. In Sicily this is particularly important, because neither the pack nor the game has ever been written about; even if anyone had stumbled on the few old cards surviving, their meaning would be opaque if the game itself had been allowed to die. These Sicilian games are of the greatest interest if one wishes to reconstruct the largely lost history of the game of Tarot in the country in which it originated. But they are far from being of antiquarian interest only: they form a variety of Tarot which, because of the greater number of counting cards, is especially interesting to play. The four-handed Calatafimi game, in particular, is unquestionably one of the great Tarot games, combining the interest of the play, common to Sicilian Tarocchi in general, with a system of bargaining designed precisely to offset the chance factor.

CHAPTER 20

The Order of the Tarot Trumps

Those who, in the eighteenth century, when the Italian suit-signs of the traditional Tarot pack were replaced by French ones, also substituted animal figures for the traditional trump subjects, and those who later replaced these with rural scenes, views of buildings or characters from the drama, obviously did not think they were depriving the pack of any essential feature. What was essential to a trump card was its position in the sequence, indicated by its number; for the rest, antiquated mediaeval figures were being replaced by subjects more to modern taste. Many people, however, have been fascinated by the figures on the trump cards of the Latin-suited Tarot pack, and have sought to uncover a hidden symbolism lost to us. They have been convinced that these figures must have a deeper meaning than appears on the surface; and, in particular, they have believed that there is a significance, not only in the individual cards, but in the precise order in which they are arranged. Foremost among these have, of course, been the occultists; but, as we saw in Chapter 6, their interpretations have been completely arbitrary, or based on false premisses such as the ancient Egyptian or Hebrew origin of the cards. In so far as the occultist interpretation has rested on anything more than whim or demonstrably spurious history, it has been based on the details of the trumps in the Tarot de Marseille pattern. If we are seeking the symbolic intentions of those who first designed the Tarot pack, the Tarot de Marseille is a dubious guide. We cannot feel sure that the pattern is, as a whole, any older than the seventeenth century; and, although the order of the trumps which it observes goes back at least to Catelin Geoffroy's pack of 1557, we do not know it to have any exact Italian prototype. Speculations based on false data are obviously worthless.

Not all of those who have sought to decode the symbolism of the Tarot pack have been occultists; some have been serious scholars, well versed in the iconography of late mediaeval and early Renaissance art. One W.M. Seabury wrote a book to prove that the symbolism of the pack was based upon Dante;[1] Miss Gertrude Moakley, in her fine book about the Visconti-Sforza pack, advanced an interpretation of the pack, supported by much evidence from Italian art and literature; Mr Ronald Decker has engaged in complicated speculations, linking the pack to the astrology of the time. I am not going to advance another such theory. I do not even want to take a stand about the theories that have been advanced. The question is whether a theory is needed at all. I do not mean to deny that some of the subjects, or some of the details of their conventional representation, may have had a symbolic significance obvious to fifteenth-century Italians, or, at least, to educated ones, that escapes us and may be revealed by patient research; that is very likely to be the case. But the question is whether the sequence as a sequence has any special symbolic meaning. I am inclined to think that it did not: to think, that is, that those who originally designed the Tarot pack were doing the equivalent, for their day, of those who later selected a sequence of animal pictures to adorn the trump cards of the new French-suited pack. They wanted to design a new kind of pack with an additional set of twenty-one picture cards that would play a special, indeed a quite new, role in the game; so they selected for those cards a number of subjects, most of them entirely familiar, that would naturally come to the mind of someone at a fifteenth-century Italian court. It is rather a random selection: we might have expected all seven principal virtues, rather than just the three we find – and, of course, we do find all seven in the Minchiate pack, and they were probably present also in the Visconti di Modrone pack. With the Sun and Moon we might have expected the other five planets, instead of just a star; with the Pope and the Emperor, we might have expected other ranks and degrees. But, of course, in a pack of cards what is essential is that each card may be instantly identified; so one does not want a large number of rather similar figures, especially before it occurred to anyone to put numerals on the trump cards for ease of identification. Certainly most of the subjects on the Tarot trumps are completely standard ones in mediaeval and Renaissance art; there seems no need of any special hypothesis to explain them. Whatever may be the truth about those who first designed the Tarot pack, the inventors of the Minchiate pack surely approached their task in the spirit I have suggested: they wanted twenty additional subjects, and they chose ones which it was natural for men of the sixteenth century to think of – the four elements, the remaining virtues, the signs of the Zodiac – and inserted them *en bloc* in a convenient place. I do not think that anyone has suggested that there is any hidden significance in the sequence of Minchiate trumps.

---

[1] William Marston Seabury, *The Tarot Cards and Dante's Divine Comedy*, New York, 1951.

That is my opinion; but I do not want to insist on it. It may be that those who first devised the Tarot pack had a special purpose in mind in selecting those particular subjects and in arranging them in the order that they did: perhaps they then spelled out, to those capable of reading them, some satirical or symbolic message. If so, it is apparent that, at least by the sixteenth century, the capacity to read this message had been lost. There are many references to *tarocchi* in sixteenth-century Italian literature, in which their symbolic potentialities were exploited, but always in an obvious way: no hint survives that any more arcane meaning was associated with them. 'What else', asks Flavio Alberto Lollio in his *Invettiva contra il Giuoco del Taroco*, 'do they signify, the Popess, the Chariot, the Traitor, the Wheel, the Hunchback, Fortitude, the Star, the Moon, Death, Hell and all the rest of this revolving bizarrerie, save that this man [the inventor of the game] had an empty head, full of smoke, caprices and idle tales?' Lollio, of course, had no interest in making much sense of the Tarot trumps; but he could hardly have written in quite this vein if there was generally acknowledged to be some particular interpretation to be placed on them.

The search for a hidden meaning may be a unicorn hunt; but, if there is a hidden meaning to be found, only a correct basis of fact will lead us to it. The hidden meaning, if any, lies in the sequential arrangement of the trump cards; and therefore, if it is to be uncovered, we must know what, originally, that arrangement was. In all Italian-suited packs made outside Italy since 1700, the order is always and everywhere the same, namely that found in the Tarot de Marseille. There is, as we have seen, some variation in the subjects: the Pope and Popess are replaced, in the Tarot de Besançon, by Jupiter and Juno, and, in the Belgian Tarot, as in de Hautot's pack, by Bacchus and the Spanish Captain. But, from the beginning of the eighteenth century, the order of the trump subjects and their numbering remain constant, in the Belgian Tarot as well as in the Tarot de Marseille and its various offshoots. In the seventeenth century, we have Viévil's pack with a significantly different order: we also have, in de Hautot's pack and the list given in the *Maison académique*, the minor variation in which the Empress was higher than the Emperor. But we also find the exact Tarot de Marseille order in the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian pack; and, as remarked, we also find it in Geoffroy's pack of 1557, so that it is plainly of considerable antiquity in France. The use of just the same order in all other countries of Europe, other than Italy, simply reflects the fact that it was to France and other French-speaking regions, including those in Switzerland, that the game of Tarot first spread from Italy, and from which it spread further to yet other lands. Since the eighteenth century, the Tarot de Marseille order has been well known in Italy itself, being observed in the Lombard pattern and in the Tarocco Piemontese which remains in wide use to this day, both patterns being descendants of the Tarot de Marseille. It will, however, already have been apparent to the reader, from what we have seen of the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate packs, that the Tarot de Marseille order was not and is not the only order for the trump cards known in Italy. In fact, there is no clear evidence that the Tarot de Marseille order was ever known in Italy before the appearance of the Lombard and Piedmontese variants of the Tarot de Marseille in the eighteenth century. There is, however, no one trump order which we could set over against that of the Tarot de Marseille as being the predominant Italian one; rather, the evidence yields a number of distinct orders used in different places or by different players.

There are three types of source that we have for the different orderings of the trumps observed by Italian card players. First, there are the three variant types of pack, the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate pack. The Minchiate pack has, of course, twenty additional trumps: but since these were inserted *en bloc* at a certain point in the sequence of standard trump subjects, we can remove them and study the resulting order in reasonable confidence that it represents an order observed for the trumps of the 78-card pack at the time the Minchiate pack was invented. Secondly, there are the early packs that survive to us. Not all of these are any help, since we noted that the trumps in the fifteenth-century hand-painted packs lack numerals, and we therefore cannot tell how they were ordered; but we have a few packs, mostly popular ones printed from wood blocks, in which the trumps bear numerals. Finally, there are literary sources. The earliest of these is the sermon against gaming in the anonymous volume of sermons once owned by Robert Steele; it is dated between 1450 and 1480, probably towards the end of that period, and gives a list of all the trumps with their numbers. A well-known list, without numbers, is given by Tomaso Garzoni (1549-1589) in his *La Piazza Universale* (Venice, 1585). Garzoni uses a phrase which has been understood to mean that he has taken the list from an earlier writer, Raffaele Maffei Volterrano (1455-1522), but no such list is known to occur in Volterrano's writings; Garzoni's remark may not be so intended.[2] The remaining two sources known to me are examples of a curious form of verse fashionable in the sixteenth century and known as *tarocchi appropriati*. We have already come across one example of this form, namely the *Germini sopra Quaranta Meritrice*, in which the Minchiate trumps are used. In a poem of this kind, a set of people is described by associating each of them with one of the trump subjects from the Tarot pack. In some cases, the trumps are not arranged in any particular order, and these poems are of no help to us; but, in two of them, the trumps are arranged in sequence. One of these is an anonymous poem first published by Giulio Bertoni in an essay on 'Tarocchi versificati' in 1917;[3] it describes the ladies of the court of Ferrara, and is dated by Bertoni to between 1520 and 1550, more probably nearer the later date. I shall refer to this as 'the Bertoni poem'. The other is a poem that has been attributed to Giambattista Susio (1519-1583), an attribution that has been contested. The poem has never been published in full, but excerpts are given by Ridolfo Renier in his essay 'Tarocchi di M.M. Boiardo' of 1894;[4] it concerns the ladies of the court of Pavia, and may have been written about 1570.

---

[2] Tomaso Garzoni, *La Piazza Universale di Tutte le Professioni del Mondo, e nobili et ignobili*, Venice, 1585. The list occurs in the chapter 'de' Giocatori in universale, et in particolare', which is Discourse 69 of the later editions, and is to be found on p. 574 of the Venice, 1586 edition. Garzoni's turn of phrase is curious: he says, 'Alcuni altri son giuochi da tauerne, come la mora, le piastrelle, le chiaui, e le carti, ò communi, ò Tarocchi, di nuoua inuentione, secondo il Volteranno: oue si vedono danari, coppe, spade, bastoni, dieci, noue, ...', and continues by listing the remaining twelve cards of each suit, followed by the trumps in descending order and finally the Matto; after a mention of the French suits (as used 'con le carte fine'), he lists a number of card games, beginning with Tarocchi and Primiera. (In English, the quoted passage runs, 'Some others are tavern games, such as *mora*, quoits, keys and cards, either ordinary ones, or tarocchi, recently invented according to Volterrano: in which are to be seen Coins, Cups, Swords, Batons, the 10, the 9, ...'. Mora is a well-known game in which each of two players simultaneously holds up a hand, with five, two or no fingers extended; I do not know what 'keys' are.) For some reason, Garzoni's reference to *tarocchi* is much the best known of the sixteenth-century ones, and is cited by a whole string of later writers, including Senftleben (Andreas Senftlebius, *De alvea veterum opusculum posthumum*, Leipzig, 1667), who mistranslates *Fortezza* as *propugnaculum* (fortress), and the notes to Saverio Bettinelli's *Il giuoco delle carte, poemetto* (Cremona, 1775); many of these attribute the list to Volterrano. Garzoni's phrase 'secondo il Volteranno' appears, however, to relate, not to the list of trumps, but to the apparent observation that *tarocchi* are a recent invention. Even on this interpretation, the remark is baffling, since Tarot cards are nowhere referred to in the *Commentariorum Urbanorum XXXVIII libri* of Raffaele Maffei, called Volterrano after his place of birth, which were first published in Rome in 1506, nor, so far as anyone has discovered, in any other of his writings, as was observed by Robert Steele in 1900; moreover, the Tarot pack had existed for a hundred and fifty years when Garzoni was writing, and for at least fifteen when Maffei was born. The explanation appears to be that Garzoni meant that playing cards in general were a recent invention, and that he was alluding to the remark by Maffei that 'Chartarum vero & sortium & divinationis ludi priscis additi sunt ab avaris ac perditis inventi' ('To the ancient games have been added those of cards and of lots and of divination, invented by covetous and dissolute men'). This remark occurs in the section 'De ludo diverso quo summi viri quandoque occupati fuerunt' of book XXIX of the *Commentaria Urbana* (p. 421 verso of the Rome, 1506, edition, p. 313 verso of the Paris, 1511, edition, and p. 694 of the Basle, 1559, edition; the second ampersand, present in the 1506 and 1511 editions, is missing from that of 1559). Maffei is meaning to convey by this observation no more than that the games he is referring to were not played in classical times. Garzoni was not, therefore, quoting him in support of any thesis that *tarocchi* were of *recent* invention, only as saying that playing cards are of modern, as opposed to ancient, origin. (I am uncertain to what Maffei was referring as *sortium & divinationis ludi*, but I do not think the passage can be treated as evidence that cards were used for fortune-telling; we have in all *three* modern types of game, cards, lots and divination, and the mention of *avari* suggests that Maffei has gambling games principally in mind.)

Before we look in detail at these various orders, a word needs to be said about the names of the cards. Tarot de Marseille trumps, and in fact all those in Italian-suited packs made anywhere outside Italy, bear their names as well as their numbers, with some slight variation on these names from one pack to another. By contrast, in Italian Tarot packs, other than those which derive from the Tarot de Marseille, the trumps never have their names inscribed on them, save for isolated cards like the *Miseria* of the Tarocco Siciliano and a few non-standard packs such as that at Rouen. We have, therefore, to appeal to literary sources for the names. Here, of course, other sources, those which name the trumps without arranging them in order, become useful. One such is a set of five sonnets on the Tarot trumps by Teofilo Folengo (1491-1544), a Mantuan author of macaronic verses; these were included in his *Caos del Triperuno*, a work published in Venice in 1527 under his pseudonym Merlin Cocai.[5] Another is Pietro Aretino's *Le Carte Parlanti*, published in Venice in 1543; and a third is Lollio's poem, already mentioned, published in Venice in 1550. There are also two other *tarocchi appropriati*, both concerning cardinals at a conclave: one relates to the conclave of 1522, which elected Adrian VI, and the other to that of 1549-50, which elected Julius III.[6] We may add to these the lists of the trumps of the Tarocco Bolognese given in the earliest eighteenth-century accounts of the game of Tarocchino and written before numerals had been added to any of the trump cards; Bolognese players were evidently as conservative in their nomenclature as in their manner of play.[7]

Most of the cards have the same name, save for trivial variations of spelling, in all the sources. Among these, the ones with names coinciding with those used in modern Tarocco Piemontese packs, and also corresponding to those of the Tarot de Marseille (given here in the right-hand column), are as follows.

The Fool	*il Matto*	*le Mat*
The Empress	*l'Imperatrice*	*l'Impératrice*
The Emperor	*l'Imperatore*	*l'Empereur*
The Popess	*la Papessa*	*la Papesse*
Temperance	*la Temperanza*	*Tempérance*
Justice	*la Giustizia*	*la Justice*
The Devil	*il Diavolo*	*le Diable*
The Moon	*la Luna*	*la Lune*
The Sun	*il Sole*	*le Soleil*
The World	*il Mondo*	*le Monde*

There are five more whose names always appear in the same form in the early sources:

---

[3] In *Poesie, leggende, costumanze del medio evo*, Modena, 1917, pp. 215-29; see pp. 220-1.

[4] In *Studi su Matteo Maria Boiardo*, ed. by N. Campanini, Bologna, 1894; see pp. 256-9.

[5] *Le opere maccheroniche di Merlin Cocai*, ed. by Attilio Portioli, vol. III, Mantua, 1890, pp. 128-33.

[6] The first is no. XXXII of the *Pasquinate di Pietro Aretino ed Anonime per il Conclave a l'Elezione di Adriano VI*, ed. by Vittorio Rossi, Palermo, 1891, also to be found in Mario dell'Arco, *Pasquino e le Pasquinate*, Milan, 1957, pp. 87-8. The second, an imitation of the first, was published by V. Cian in his 'Gioviana', *Giornale storico della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. XVII, 1890, pp. 338-40.

[7] Stuart R. Kaplan, in his *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, cites yet another source; on p. 30 he states that Antonio Francesco Grazzini wrote in *Tutti i trionfi, carri, mascherate o canti carnascialeschi andati per Firenze dal tempo del magnifico Lorenzo de' Medici fino all'anno 1559* about the *tarocchi* trumps. On p. 359, he repeats this claim, attributing the whole book to Grazzini. Poems by Grazzini (il Lasca) are indeed included in this collection, which he in fact edited, but I can find no reference in them or in any other poems in the volume to *tarocchi*. Perhaps Mr Kaplan was misled by the occurrence of the term *trionfi* in the title: it does not there refer to Tarot trumps or triumphs, but is used in the sense of 'triumphal processions'; see the section on Festivals in J. Burckhardt's *Civilisation of the Renaissance*.

Fortitude always appears in them as *la Fortezza*; it is *la Force* (Strength) in the Tarot de Marseille, and likewise *la Forza* (Strength) in the Tarocco Piemontese.

Love always appears in the early sources as *l'Amore*; in the Tarot de Marseille it is *l'Amoureux* (the Lover) and in the Tarocco Piemontese *gli Amanti* (the Lovers).

Death is always called *la Morte*, as in the Tarocco Piemontese; in the Tarot de Marseille, it is almost always left unnamed.

The Star is always *la Stella* in the early sources; in the Tarot de Marseille it is, likewise, *l'Étoile* (the Star), but in the Tarocco Piemontese *le Stelle* (the Stars).

The Angel is always *l'Angelo* in the early sources, save in the Minchiate pack, in which it is *le Trombe* (the Trumpets). In the Tarot de Marseille it is *le Jugement* (the Judgment), though a pack made in Strasbourg has *la Trompette* (the Trumpet), and it is similarly referred to as *la Trompe* in Viévil's pack. In the Tarocco Piemontese it is sometimes labelled *il Giudizio* (the Judgment), but usually as *l'Angelo*.

This leaves six cards whose names vary in the early sources. For three of these, the differences are trifling.

The Bagatto, called *le Bateleur* in the Tarot de Marseille and, usually, *il Bagatto* in the Tarocco Piemontese, is referred to as *il Bagatella* in most of the early sources; Pietro Aretino alone uses the name *il Bagatto*, and only as an alternative. In the poem on the 1549 conclave, the form used is *il Bagatello*. The term is *il Bagatino* in the Bertoni poem, like the form *il Bagattino* used by Bolognese players.

The Chariot is usually called *il Carro*, as it is in the Tarocco Piemontese, corresponding to *le Chariot* in the Tarot de Marseille. In the Steele MS. and in Aretino it appears more explicitly as *il Carro triumphale* (the triumphal Chariot).

The Wheel, called *la Roue de Fortune* (the Wheel of Fortune) in the Tarot de Marseille and likewise *la Ruota di Fortuna* in the Tarocco Piemontese, is usually abbreviated to *la Rota* or *la Ruota* (the Wheel) in the early sources; only the two poems on the conclaves use the full term. However, the idea is just the same, and Fortune is almost always mentioned in connection with this card.

The only serious variations in nomenclature are confined to three cards:

The card known to modern players as *the Hermit* – *l'Ermite* in the Tarot de Marseille (*le Capucin* in some related packs) and *l'Eremita* in the Tarocco Piemontese – has three names in the early sources. In the Steele MS., in the Bertoni poem and in Lollio, it is *il Gobbo* (the Hunchback). In Garzoni, in Susio and in the poem on the 1522 conclave, as also for Bolognese players, it is *il Vecchio* (the Old Man); compare Viévil's term *le Vielart*. In Teofilo Folengo it is *il Tempo* (Time). (Aretino and the other conclave poem fail to mention it.)

The Hanged Man – *le Pendu* in the Tarot de Marseille and *il Penduto* in the Tarocco Piemontese – is *l'Impiccato* in the Steele MS. and in Garzoni, and *l'Appicato* in Teofilo Folengo, both meaning 'the Hanged Man'. For all the rest, including the Bolognese players, it is *il Traditore* (the Traitor).

The Tower, called *la Torre* in the Tarocco Piemontese and *la Maison Dieu* (the House of God, or, perhaps, the Hospital) in the Tarot de Marseille, bears a variety of names in the early sources. In the Steele MS. it is *la Sagitta*, literally 'the Arrow' but more probably meaning 'the Thunderbolt'; for Bolognese players it was *la Saetta*, also meaning 'the Thunderbolt' (compare *la Foudre* (the Lightning) in the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian pack, those of Viévil and de Hautot and in the Belgian Tarot). The Bertoni poem calls it *la Casa del Diavolo* (the House of the Devil), by which name it was also known to Minchiate players; the poem on the 1549 conclave has the variant *là Casa del Dannato* (the House of the Damned), while that on the 1522 conclave calls it simply *la Casa* (the House). In Garzoni, Folengo and Susio it is *il Fuoco* (the Fire). Lollio calls it *l'Inferno* (Hell) outright. Aretino leaves it unmentioned.

In order to have a uniform terminology for making comparisons between different orders, without falsely implying that a particular term is used in each of the sources, I shall in what follows use English names (save for the Bagatto). For the last three cards mentioned above, I shall use 'the

Hermit', 'the Hanged Man' and 'the Tower'.

Among the variant packs, the Tarocco Bolognese, considered in its older form before the *Papi* were replaced by Moors, contains precisely the standard trump subjects; it merely fails to yield an order among themselves for the Pope, Popess, Emperor and Empress. The Tarocco Siciliano has several unfamiliar subjects: but the Globe obviously corresponds to the World, we know from Villabianca that the Ship is a replacement for the Devil and we may reasonably assume that Jupiter stands in place of the Angel. In the Minchiate pack, the 'Grand Duke' does not correspond precisely to any card or other packs, but clearly belongs with the two Imperial cards. It is evident that the insertion of the twenty extra cards has not been allowed to disturb the order of the familiar ones; it is especially striking that the four additional Virtues have not been placed next to the three that were already there, but have been grouped together with the other new cards. We are therefore justified in extracting from the Minchiate pack an order for the standard Tarot trumps. This is confirmed by a certain feature of the design of Minchiate trumps. The trumps cards from XVI to XXXV, that is, the twenty additional ones, bear rosettes in the two top corners. Of the remaining trumps, the top five unnumbered ones and those from I to XV, only trumps I and II have rosettes in the top corners. A possible explanation is that the original designer of the Minchiate pack, whose designs were thereafter faithfully copied, used existing designs for the trumps of an ordinary Tarocco pack as far as he could, and invented new designs for the additional cards. Some adjustment would be necessary with the lowest cards, owing to the reduction in number of the Imperial/Papal cards from four to three; the purpose of the rosettes may have been to indicate to the cardmaker himself which designs he would be unable to use for ordinary 78-card Tarocco packs.

In Chapter 4 a list was given of all known surviving sets of fifteenth-century Italian Tarot cards. The first twenty of these consisted of the hand-painted cards, made for the nobility, which have survived in considerable numbers; but, in addition, there were listed, as nos. (21) to (24), four popular packs, dating from the end of the fifteenth century, from which one or more uncut sheets have survived; the Boiardo pack and the copper-engraved Sola-Busca *tarocchi*, being to a high degree non-standard, were not included in the list. The dating of the four popular packs, (21) to (24), as late fifteenth-century, is admittedly not unshakable: any of them may be assignable to the beginning of the sixteenth. We may now extend the list to cover Italian Tarot cards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The vogue for expensive hand-painted packs died away in the sixteenth century; accepting nos. (21) to (24) of Chapter 4 as of the fifteenth century, we are left with only four sixteenth-century Italian Tarot packs of which we have any knowledge. With the numbering continued from Chapter 4, these are:

(25) A set of thirty cards belonging to the Leber Collection in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Rouen. They comprise the King, Queen, Cavalier, Jack, 9, 6 and Ace of Swords; the King, Cavalier, 9, 7, 5, 4, 2 and Ace of Batons; the 9, 8 and 7 of Cups; the King, Jack, 9 and Ace of Coins; and the Fool and seven trumps. The trumps are numbered with Arabic numerals, and are the Emperor (4), the Pope (5), the Chariot (7), the Wheel of Fortune (10), Time, corresponding to the Hermit (11), the Devil (14) and the Star (16). The pack is obviously non-standard, and is a classicised one: the court figures are labelled with inscriptions in Latin identifying them with characters of classical history (e.g. the King of Coins with Midas, King of the Lydians), while the trump cards, although clearly identifiable with the usual subjects, also have Latin inscriptions interpreting them in terms of classical mythology (e.g. the Devil is represented by Pluto and is labelled 'Perditorum Raptor'). The numeral cards are very elaborate, the Batons, in particular, being depicted as whole trees.[8]

(26) A complete pack, very closely related to the one at Rouen, but not identical with it, was known to Count Leopoldo Cicognara, and was described by him in his book on playing cards of 1831.[9] He illustrated it by all four Aces and trump cards showing Apollo and Cupid, obviously representing the Sun and Love cards. This pack has now disappeared; it evidently did not have inscriptions on

---

[8] Catalogue number 135-XIV. The cards measure 134 x 70 mm. Four are illustrated in colour by D. Hoffmann, *Die Welt der Spielkarte*, Leipzig, 1972, plate 23b, nine in black and white by Kaplan, op. cit., p. 133, and five by H.-R. D'Allemagne, *Les Cartes à jouer*, vol. I, Paris, 1906, opposite p. 186.

[9] See L. Cicognara, *Memorie spettanti alla Storia della Calcografia*, Prato, 1831, pp. 163-6 and plate XIV; A.M. Hind, *Early Italian Engraving*, vol. I, London, 1938, pp. 241 and 243, and vol. V, London, 1948, pp. 139-40; and D. Hoffmann, op. cit., fig. 6. Hind attributes the pack to Nicoletto da Modena.

the trump or court cards, nor, apparently, numerals on the trumps. The Aces differ considerably from those at Rouen; furthermore, the Fool of the Rouen pack is quite different from that described, though not illustrated, by Cicognara. Cicognara's Fool was a drunkard lying on his back, supporting, with his legs in the air, a jar marked MUSCATELLO. The Fool of the Rouen set shows a man armed to the teeth and dressed in armour, but with genitals exposed and urinating; the inscription reads 'VELIM FUNDAM DARI MIHI'. Nevertheless, Cicognara's pack was a classicised one of very much the same kind as that at Rouen.

(27) A single card, showing the Devil, is in the British Musuem.[10] The back gives the maker's name as Agnolo Hebreo. It is unnumbered, and the design is very similar to that on the Rothschild sheet (no. (23)), but it is much cruder in execution.

(28) Another isolated card is in the Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Popolari in Rome: it is numbered VIII and represents Love.[11] It shows two musicians playing a viol da gamba and a lute, and, behind them, a pair of embracing lovers: above them, as usual on all versions of this card, hovers Cupid aiming his bow. The design does not correspond in detail to any other known version, but is in no way surprising.

This may appear a meagre crop for a whole century, but compares favourably with the single surviving pack from sixteenth-century France. As before, we cannot be certain, when dealing with Italy, that we have identified all surviving cards from Tarot packs; it is possible that some of the suit cards that have survived in fact come from such packs, without our having any means of knowing this. The wealth of literary references assures us that the game continued, in the sixteenth century, to enjoy both popularity and renown. It is unnecessary to list Tarocchino and Minchiate packs made in the seventeenth century, since they are readily identifiable as such; when these are set aside, our list may be extended to the seventeenth century as follows:

(29) A set of six *tarocchi* was found, among other cards, at the Castello Sforzesco in Milan during restoration work. They consist of the 6, 7 and 9 of Swords, the 8 of Batons, the 6 of Coins and the World, numbered XXI. They measure 138 x 68 mm., and have backs showing a complex design identified by Francesco Novati as depicting Ruggero and Angelica; the design has a dotted border, folded over to form a similar border for the faces of the cards. The backs, and consequently the borders, have peeled off from the 8 of Batons, 9 of Swords and the World. The suit cards resemble those of the Tarot de Marseille very closely, with the major exception that they bear no numerals to indicate their rank, and the minor one that, on the odd-numbered cards of the Swords suit, the crosspiece of the single sword is straight, not S-shaped as in most Tarot de Marseille packs (a Tarot de Besançon made in 1784 by Bernhard Schaer of Mümliswil being an exception). The single trump, the World, is similar in general design, though not in precise detail, to the corresponding card in the Tarot de Marseille, showing a naked female figure enclosed in an oval wreath, with the symbols of the four Evangelists at the corners. The card does not bear an inscription giving its name. It is inscribed XXI above the top margin, but this inscription would have been covered by the border folded over from the back when the card was in its original condition. Novati assigns these cards to the early sixteenth century; but they seem more likely to be from some date in the seventeenth.[12]

(30) Two incomplete uncut sheets from a Portuguese-suited Tarot pack are in the British Museum. One shows the Maids of Swords and Batons, the Cavalier of Batons and fragments of the 3 of Swords and Cavalier of Coins. The other shows trumps bearing Arabic numerals but not names: they consist of the Wheel (11), the Chariot (10), Love (6), a card depicting a Sultan and numbered 5, and two fragmentary cards numbered 20 and 21, presumably the World and the Angel respectively. The 2 of Swords bears the inscription 'Alla Colonna in Piazza Nicosia'. Italian cardmakers from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century identified themselves by signs which, like English inn-signs, presumably hung outside their workshops; usually the sign itself and its name appear on the backs of the cards. The pack is thought to have been made in Rome, there being a Piazza Nicosia in that city. There are also in the British Museum two fragmentary sheets from a regular Portuguese-suited pack by the same maker, showing the Kings, Cavaliers, Maids and Aces of all four suits, and the 2 to 6 and fragments of the 7 and 9 of the Swords suit. A column, which was also the heraldic emblem of the Colonna family, appears on a shield borne by the Maid of Swords in both packs, and on one borne by the Maid of Cups in the regular pack; on the 2 of Swords of the regular pack appears the date 1613. The small details of design of the cards

---

[10] Illustrated in D. Hoffmann, op. cit., plate 14a.

[11] Illustrated in *Antiche Carte da Tarocchi*, Rome, 1961, plate XII. The back shows a standing Cupid.

[12] The cards are in the Raccolta delle Stampe Achille Bertarelli at the Castello Sforzesco. For Novati's articles, see footnote 22.

common to both packs are not precisely the same, but the pattern used is identical, and corresponds closely to that of other Portuguese-suited packs made at the time when this had become recognised as a quite distinct suit-system. In both packs, the Maids are girls with long gowns, and the Swords are straight but intersecting; further, each suit card has an index at both top centre and bottom centre (FS, FB, FC and FD for the Maids, RS, etc., for the Kings, CS, etc., for the Cavaliers, AS, etc., for the Aces and S2, S3, etc., for the numeral cards from 2 up). In the regular pack, the Kings are seated, there are dragons on the Aces and the Batons have a shape very characteristic of Portuguese-suited packs.[13]

(31) There are several extant examples of a puzzling kind of pack made by a cardmaker using the name 'Orfeo': the backs of his cards give this name with an elaborate design of Orpheus playing his lute. The Beinecke Library at Yale has two nearly complete ones and another, very fragmentary, one; two others are in the British Museum, while the Fournier Museum in Vitoria has fragments of three packs (and one card from a fourth).[14] These packs are invariably catalogued as incomplete Minchiate packs. The reason is that the trumps display exactly the designs of the Minchiate ones: the top five trumps, left unnumbered in the Minchiate pack, are unnumbered in the Orfeo packs also, and those that are numbered bear the same numbers as in the Minchiate pack. Furthermore, as in the Minchiate pack, the Swords are straight but intersecting. In other respects, however, the Orfeo packs deliberately diverge from the highly constant Minchiate designs. This is true of the Fool and of the Aces, and in some degree of the Kings; but the most striking divergences are in the two lower court cards. In the Minchiate pack, the Cavaliers, although still called *Cavalli*, are centaurs in Swords and Batons, and other half-human, half-animal creatures in Cups and Coins; but in the Orfeo packs, they are the conventional mounted knights. In the Minchiate pack, the Cups and Coins suits, though not the other two, have Maids instead of Jacks as the lowest court cards; but in the Orfeo packs, there are distinctly male Jacks in all four suits, and their designs in no way resemble the Minchiate ones. If there were anything to compel us to regard the Orfeo packs as intended for the game of Minchiate, we should have to treat them as exhibiting certain deviant features; but there is not. Although the designs of all surviving trump cards from Orfeo packs coincide with those used in Minchiate packs, no Orfeo pack is known which has any of those twenty trump subjects which are peculiar to the Minchiate pack, which, unlike every other form of the Tarot pack, had in all forty trumps (in addition to the Fool). The probability is, therefore, that the Orfeo packs were originally 78-card ones. Perhaps the designs used were not at that time regarded as the exclusive property of the Minchiate pack, which had probably taken them over, at the time of its invention in the previous century, from some local standard pattern for the normal Tarot pack; or, possibly, the cardmaker using the sign Orfeo found it more economical to use Minchiate blocks, so far as he could, to produce ordinary 78-card Tarot packs. This conclusion cannot be regarded as certain, however, because one oddity remains. In none of the Orfeo packs I have mentioned is there any trump below IX (or VIIII as it is written). To make a complete set of Tarot trumps, there would have to be nine such trumps, perhaps leaving the Bagatto unnumbered, or, just conceivably, with a trump XVI to insert between the extant XV (the Tower) and the five top unnumbered trumps: in any case, they would have to diverge in some respect from the Minchiate trumps, which do not include the Pope and Popess and have only the eight trumps numbered I to VIII below the IX. It may be mere coincidence that these nine trumps happen to be missing from all surviving examples of the Orfeo pack; but, until an example is found that includes some of them, it remains a fact that seems to call for explanation, and, until one is hit on, we cannot feel assured that we have correctly interpreted the pack.

Considering the rarity of pre-eighteenth-century cards generally, we cannot regard this as a poor haul; and we have, in addition, seventeenth-century examples both of the Minchiate and Tarocchino packs. Nevertheless, the dearth of literary and textual references, save to Minchiate, from this century suggests that the popularity of the game of Tarocco, as played with the 78-card pack, was distinctly on the wane in mainland Italy, though Minchiate and Tarocchino continued to flourish. In the next century, of course, games with the 78-card pack were to enjoy a great revival in Lombardy and Piedmont.

Of all these packs, made in Italy between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries inclusive, there are, apart from the Minchiate and Tarocchino packs, just nine that yield an order, complete or incomplete, for the trump cards. Two of these are fifteenth-century ones printed from wood blocks and preserved in the form of uncut sheets: that in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, no. (21) of Chapter 4; and that in the Rosenwald Collection in Washington, no. (22) of Chapter 4. The Metropolitan set includes an almost complete sequence of trumps, of which the World is definitely unnumbered, and the rest appear to have borne Roman numerals from I to XX. The sheets are mutilated, so that a few of the trumps are missing or fragmentary. Only the tops of the Pope, Emperor, Popess and Empress survive, bearing the numerals II to V, but only the Popess (III) can be identified with certainty, although, given that, the positions of the others admit of little doubt. Another card of which only the top remains may be either the Bagatto or the Fool: no numeral is to be seen. There is only the right-hand half of the Chariot, without the numeral. Of three cards, only the left-hand halves survive: one is easily identified as the Hanged Man, with a numeral beginning XI.. that can only be XII; one appears to be the Star, with a numeral beginning XV.., which would have to be XVI, but may possibly be the Moon, in which case the numeral must be XVII; and the third, which is also truncated below, is unidentifiable and shows no numeral, but is probably Fortitude. Save for the relative positions of Fortitude and the Chariot, it is possible to reconstruct the order completely with virtual certainty.

---

[13] See *Playing Cards of Various Ages and Countries selected from the Collection of Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, vol. III, London, 1895, plates 44 and 45. The Tarot pack, but not the regular one, is illustrated in Kaplan, op. cit., p. 134.

[14] The new catalogue no. of the more complete Orfeo pack in the Cary Collection at Yale is ITA-63; the old no. was I-11, the other Orfeo pack being I-96. The Orfeo packs in the Fournier Museum are grouped as no. 10 in the Italian section of the catalogue. For the British Museum ones, see F.M. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of the Collection of Playing Cards bequeathed to the Trustees of the British Museum by the late Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, London, 1901, I-59 and I-60.

In the Rosenwald set, all the trumps, without the Fool, are printed on one sheet, together with three Queens. The only mutilated card is the Wheel, on which the numeral, if there was one, can no longer be seen. Unlike on the Metropolitan sheets, the trumps are arranged on the sheet more or less in sequence. The bottom line contains the three Queens and the first five trumps from the Bagatto (I) to the Pope (V). The middle line begins with Love (VI), Temperance (VII) and Justice (VIII). These are followed by Fortitude, also numbered VIII, and the Chariot, numbered X. Evidently the VIII on Fortitude is a mistake for VIIII. There follows the Hermit, numbered XII, the Hanged Man, which is definitely unnumbered, and the Wheel, of which we cannot tell whether it had a numeral. The cards on the top line, running from Death to the Angel, are all unnumbered, and are arranged in a plausible order, indeed, in what, by analogy with other packs, is the only possible order, given the numbers assigned to the other cards. There are two possible hypotheses about the end of the second line. One is that the cards are arranged in the correct sequence, but that the Hermit has been misnumbered XII instead of XI. On this hypothesis, proposed by Sylvia Mann, the Wheel was not numbered, and the numbering stopped at XI. An alternative hypothesis seems to me a little more probable. This is that the Hermit is correctly numbered XII, and that the Wheel was numbered XI, but was located slightly out of sequence on the block. I shall follow this second hypothesis in the comparative table given below.

Although fifteenth-century hand-painted packs do not usually have numerals on the trumps, there are two exceptions to this. One is the celebrated 'Charles VI' pack, no. (4) in Chapter 4. A fact seldom referred to in the extensive discussions of this pack in the literature is that the trumps bear lower-case Roman numerals at the very top, in a fifteenth-century hand. Robert Steele listed these in his 1900 *Archaeologia* article. The cards are in fact printed from a wood block with the colours subsequently painted by hand; and, on the basis of some technical considerations concerning the process of production, Steele asserted that the numerals were written on the cards before they were painted. Detlef Hoffmann has denied this, maintaining that the numerals were added later, and were not intended to be part of the original designs. In this he is almost certainly right. They do not lose their importance for that reason: they represent an order which, at an early period, their owner at the time thought they ought to have. I have not seen these cards myself, and rely on Steele for the numbering. In one particular, he seems likely to be wrong: he gives the numeral for the Pope as ii, and adds a question mark to show his uncertainty about the reading. But the Pope can hardly rank lower than the Emperor, which is iij; moreover, in every other case, a terminal i is written j. It is therefore probable that the numeral on the Pope was intended to be iiij.

The other exception is the very incomplete Catania set no. (7) in Chapter 4. On three of the four surviving trumps Arabic numerals have at some time been inscribed in ink; these inscriptions cannot be contemporary with the cards, and may be conjectured to have been made in the seventeenth century. The fourth surviving trump is the figure on the stag, which Ronald Decker has interpreted as an unusual representation of Temperance; to this no numeral has been added, presumably because whoever added them could not identify the subject.

From the sixteenth century we have two remnants of packs with numbered trumps. One is the single card at Rome depicting Love and numbered VIII, no. (28) above. The other is the classicised pack at Rouen, no. (25) above, whose trumps, readily identified with their counterparts in ordinary packs, bear Arabic numerals and inscriptions giving their names in Latin; I differ from Detlef Hoffmann in equating Pluto, not, as he does, with Death, but with the Devil.

Finally, there are three fragmentary packs from the seventeenth century. One is the very inomplete sheet of trump cards for the Portuguese-suited alla Colonna pack, no. (30) above; this has Arabic numerals, which were presumably borne by all the trumps, since they go up to 21. The second is the Orfeo pack, no. (31) above, of which several examples exist; this has Roman numerals, but the top five trumps are unnumbered, as in the Minchiate pack. Finally, there is the set of six Tarot cards found at the Castello Sforzesco, of which only one is a trump, the World, numbered XXI.

From the four literary sources and from the three variant types of Tarot pack, we obtain complete orders for all the trumps; from the nine fragmentary early packs with numbered trumps, we obtain further orders with varying degrees of incompleteness, of which those of the Metropolitan Museum, Rosenwald and Charles VI packs can be reconstructed in their entirety with very little uncertainty. Of the orders which we know in complete detail, only two agree exactly, those given by Garzoni and in the Bertoni poem; the order in the Metropolitan Museum pack almost certainly also nearly coincides with that in these two sources, and that of the Rouen pack may very well have done so as well. The order in the alla Colonna pack may have been the same as that in the Rosenwald pack, save for carrying the numbering through to 21 and having a Sultan in place of the Pope; the order underlying the numbering on the three Catania cards may have been the same as in the Orfeo pack, save that the numbering is carried at least as far as 19. All the rest have at least minor differences between them. Ignoring the isolated Love card at Rome, we thus have eleven distinct orders, all differing from the Tarot de Marseille order.

This is a very surprising fact. Games players do not in the least mind having to master a complicated and arbitrary sequential ordering (for instance, the ranking, in 'civil' and 'military' suits, of dominoes in Chinese domino games); but they do require that any such ordering be held constant. It is of the essence of Tarot games that there be a determinate means of deciding which card in any trick is the winning one, and this necessarily requires an agreed ordering of the trump cards; in special cases there may be exceptions, such as the equal ranking of the *Papi* or Moors in the Bolognese game, but anything of this kind is necessarily an exception, not the general rule, and, indeed, this is the only known such exception. If play is to be possible, the ranking of the trumps must be apparent to all players and subject to no dispute.

How, then, are we to explain the variations that we find in the order of the trumps in Italy from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century? One explanation, which we glanced at earlier, can be ruled out immediately, although it has been proposed by some, the suggestion, namely, that the Tarot trumps did not originally have an order at all. If what, in the early chapters of this book, we called the triumph cards did not have an order, they were not trumps, and the game played with the pack cannot have been a trick-taking game; in that case, the suit cards cannot have had an order either, since it is only in trick-taking games that an order is required. We should then have to suppose that, at some time between the first invention of the Tarot pack in the 1430s and its spread to France and the appearance of packs with numbered trump cards, say around 1480, a new type of game was invented, for play with the Tarot pack, and a new employment, within this game, found for the triumph cards, namely as genuine trumps. We should have to assume this, to account for the etymological connection between *triumphi* and 'trump', for the subsequent history of the game of Tarot in Italy and in France, and for the reversed ranking, in the two pairs of suits, of the numeral cards, already going out in Italy by the beginning of the sixteenth century, as the game of Trappola shows. Above all, we should have to assume it to explain the fact that, from the author of the fifteenth-century

Steele sermon on, writers assign an order to the trump cards. But then we are faced with the same problem as before: why are the orders different in different sources? The hypothesis completely fails to explain that which it was its sole object to explain. We have no evidence that the trump cards ever lacked an order; we have abundant evidence that they had an order: our problem is that this order is not constant. It is no explanation of the variations in the order to propose that, at the start, there was no order at all.

A more specious explanation is that, once it became the practice to inscribe numerals on the trumps, it ceased to be important to maintain a fixed order for the trump subjects. Our surprise at the variations in order is due, on this view, to our being accustomed to the Italian-suited packs used outside Italy, with their unswerving uniformity of order: but there was in fact no need for such uniformity. In the early French-suited packs which have animals on the trumps, it is common to find the same selection of animals arranged in different orders; in the same way, the standard selection of trump subjects in the Latin-suited packs may have varied without causing any confusion.

The idea underlying this suggestion is that, once the trump cards bore numerals, the players would have identified them from those numerals and not from the subjects depicted, as they unquestionably did from the start with the French-suited packs. But this idea is borne out neither by the early Italian Tarot cards that survive to us, nor by the literary references. It *is* correct, indeed, for the Minchiate trumps, which were too numerous for anyone to memorise the order of any but the five top cards, the *arie*; and, accordingly, in literary sources, the first thirty-five Minchiate trumps are virtually always referred to by number and not by name; we do not even know what subject Minchiate trump II was intended to represent. By contrast, the *tarocchi* trumps are *never* referred to by number; of the various literary texts that mention them, only one, the Steele MS. sermon, even cites their numbers. Of the four sets of fifteenth-century sheets for Tarot cards, the Cary sheet and the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets have no numerals at all, while the Rosenwald sheet leaves as many as nine cards unnumbered; and we know that at Bologna it was not until the later eighteenth century that any of the trumps began to be numbered. On the trump cards of the later French-suited Tarot packs, the numerals form one of the most prominent features. In those used in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and, eventually, France, these numerals are contained in a separate panel extending across the card; though this is not true of the packs made in the Austrian Empire, the numerals are still very prominent. This is not so with the early Italian cards. Only on the alla Colonna trumps are the Arabic numerals clear and regularly placed. The numerals on the Metropolitan Museum trumps are quite insignificantly placed; for instance, the figures XV appear on the left of the head of the Angel, while the remainder of the numeral, IIII, is set on the right; on the Sun card, the figure XVIII is set more than half-way down the card, just above the trees on which the Sun is shining. One can hardly suppose that these numerals were intended as more than a last resort in identifying the cards. Something very interesting happens in the Minchiate pack. On the trumps peculiar to that pack, trumps XVI to XXXV, the numerals are placed in a scroll at the top of each card, making them easy to pick out; but, on the fifteen lowest trumps, the numerals are placed in a much more random fashion in blank spaces of the design. It is probable that these lowest trumps – or at least those from V to XV – represent designs originally used for trumps of a 78-card *tarocchi* pack, taken over when the Minchiate pack was first invented. The numerals on the Orfeo trumps are, of course, placed in the same way, and those of the Rosenwald sheet, though clearer than the Metropolitan Museum ones, are also far from being very prominent. As for the numeral on the Castello Sforzesco World card, it would have been invisible to a player, and perhaps was intended only as a reminder for the cardmaker himself.

From all this it is plain that Italian players were highly conscious of the trump subjects, and did not rely principally upon the numerals in order to identify the cards. If the true explanation of the variation in the order of the subjects were that the subjects did not matter, the cards being identified by numeral, we should expect that at least the subjects of the really important cards would have been held constant; yet we shall find that the variation affects even the top three trumps. In some orders, the Angel is the highest trump, followed by the World and then by the Sun; in others, the World is the highest, followed by Justice and only then by the Angel; or, again, the World may be the highest, the Angel second highest and then the Sun. For the variations to be explicable on the ground that the players were indifferent to the subjects associated with the numbers, they woud have had to be altogether oblivious to them for the variations at this level to have passed unnoticed, whereas, from the way in which the trumps are referred to in the literary sources, it is apparent that they were not. The most striking example of the importance of the subjects, at least at the highest level, is the persistence in Piedmont of the tradition that the Angel beats the World, in face of the contrary numerical ordering on the cards being used. It seems probable, rather, that the very reverse of the present suggestion is close to the truth; that just as, at Bologna, a player of *tarocchi* had, until the later eighteenth century, to make the fixed conventional ordering of the trumps second nature to him, so players of other varieties of Tarot, save for Minchiate, identified the trump cards principally by subject, and were aware of, and could have stated, the order of those subjects.

If this was so, it would have been hopelessly confusing for the players if the order of the trumps had varied even in minor respects from one pack of cards to another. The observable variations in the order must therefore be due, not to the absence of a fixed order, but to that phenomenon evident throughout the entire history of the game of Tarot: the extreme localisation of specific modes of play. Again and again we find that the players in one city or town play only amongst themselves and do not know those of a neighbouring town; the detailed rules, and sometimes the whole type of game played, diverge from locality to locality, the players in one circle being quite unaware of the manner of play of those in another, and, often, of their very existence. The different orders for the trumps that we find in Italy must represent different practices adopted in different cities, presumably at a stage earlier than that at which numerals came regularly to be inscribed on the trump cards. Evidently, quite a short time after the game of Tarot had first been invented, players in various cities or regions developed local peculiarities in their modes of play, which, in Italy, extended to the conventional order of the trumps; this must have happened before it became usual anywhere to inscribe numerals on the trump cards, and hence before the end of the fifteenth century. Modern players might feel that it would be impossible to memorise the order of twenty-one trump subjects so accurately as to be at once aware, without the need for reflection, which card was superior to which; but, as we know from the Bolognese game, this doubt is quite misplaced. The different orders of the trumps testify, not to a reliance on the numerals alone, but to the existence, at an early date, of wide local variation in the manner of play.

When we look closely at the various orders, we find that there was far from being total chaos. A first impression is of a good deal of regularity which, however, is hard to specify. Now the cards which wander most unrestrainedly within the sequence, from one ordering to another, are the three Virtues. If we remove these three cards, and consider the sequence formed by the remaining eighteen trump cards, it becomes very easy to state those features of their arrangement which remain constant in all the orderings. Ignoring the Virtues, we can say that the sequence of the remaining trumps falls into three distinct segments, an initial one, a middle one and a final one, all variation in order occurring only *within* these different segments.

The first segment consists of the Bagatto and the four Papal and Imperial cards (three in the Minchiate pack, two only in the Tarocco Siciliano). Save in the Tarocco Siciliano, where the *Miseria* or *Povertà* comes below it, the Bagatto is always the lowest trump. The Pope, when present, is always the highest member of this initial segment. In all known Italian trump orders, the Emperor ranks higher than the Empress, as one might expect; but it will be recalled that in the pack made at Rouen by Adam de Hautot, and also in the list given in the *Maison académique des jeux* of 1659, the Empress outranks her spouse. In Italian trump orders, on the other hand, the only opportunity for variation within this segment lies in the position of the Popess. In different orders, she occupies one of three possible positions: immediately below the Pope and above the Emperor; below the Emperor but above the Empress; and below even the Empress.

The middle segment consists of five cards, of which the typical order is, from lowest to highest: Love, the Chariot, the Wheel, the Hermit, the Hanged Man. That very order is found in the Tarocco Bolognese, the Charles VI numbering (the Wheel cannot have come anywhere but at no. 10), the Rosenwald pack (on the above hypothesis as to the intended order), the Steele sermon, Susio's poem and the Viévil pack; the alla Colonna pack must also have had that order, unless the Hermit and the Hanged Man were reversed. In all other cases, the order within this segment results from interchanging some one pair of adjacent cards: in the Minchiate and Orfeo packs (and presumably in the numbering of the Catania cards), the Wheel and the Chariot have been interchanged; in the Tarocco Siciliano the Hermit and the Hanged Man; in Garzoni's book, the Bertoni poem and probably the Metropolitan Museum pack, Love and the Chariot; and, in the Tarot de Marseille, the Wheel and the Hermit. (If Miss Mann's hypothesis, mentioned above, concerning the order in the Rosenwald pack be adopted in preference to mine, that pack forms the sole exception to this rule.)

The final segment consists of Death, the Devil, the Tower, the Star, the Moon, the Sun, the World and the Angel. These always occur (ignoring possible intervening Virtues) in precisely the order just stated, with the sole but very important exception that, sometimes, the position of the World and the Angel are reversed, the World coming highest.

If, now, in the light of this analysis, we look at the actual orders, we see that they divide into three sharply distinct types, which I shall arbitrarily label type A, type B and type C. These types are to be distinguished according to two principles: where the Virtues come; and whether the Angel or the World is the highest card. In type A, the Angel is the highest trump, the World coming immediately below it. The three Virtues, Temperance, Fortitude and Justice, occur consecutively, usually interposed just above the lowest card of the middle segment, which, in orders of this type, at least whenever we can tell, is invariably Love. Type A is not attested by any of our four literary sources. On the other hand, it is well supported by actual packs. All three variant packs – the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate pack – belong to this type; so do the Charles VI numbering and the Rosenwald and Orfeo packs.

So also must the alla Colonna pack have done: at least, if the three Virtues did not come between Love as no. 6 and the Chariot as no. 10, the order must have been very non-standard. Almost certainly the Catania numbering also exemplifies this type: the numbering of the Chariot as 10 and the Hermit as 11 surely implies that all three Virtues ranked below the Chariot, and the World as 19 must have ranked below the Angel.

In orders of type A, the three Virtues rank immediately above Love, except in the Tarocco Siciliano pack, where they rank immediately below it, and in the Tarocco Bolognese, where they outrank the second lowest card of the middle segment, the Chariot. In type A orders, Temperance is always the lowest of the three Virtues, whenever we can tell. In the Tarocco Bolognese and the Rosenwald pack, Fortitude is higher than Justice, but in the Tarocco Siciliano, the Minchiate pack and the Charles VI numbering, it is Justice which is higher.

Tar. Bolognese	*Minchiate*	*Tar. Siciliano*	*Charles VI*	*Rosenwald*	*alla Colonna*	*Orfeo*	*Catania*
Angel	Angel	20 Jupiter	20 Angel	Angel	21 ?	Angel	
World	World	19 Globe	19 World	World	20 ?	World	19 World
Sun	Sun	18 Sun	18 Sun	Sun		Sun	
Moon	Moon	17 Moon	17 Moon	Moon		Moon	
16 Star	Star	16 Star		Star		Star	
15 Tower	. . . .	15 Tower	15 Tower	Tower		15 Tower	
14 Devil	15 Tower	14 Ship		Devil		14 Devil	
13 Death	14 Devil	13 Death	13 Death	Death		13 Death	
12 Hanged Man	13 Death	12 Hermit	12 Hanged Man	Hanged Man		12 Hanged Man	
11 Hermit	12 Hanged Man	11 Hanged Man	11 Hermit	12 Hermit		11 Hermit	11 Hermit
10 Wheel	11 Hermit	10 Wheel		? 11 Wheel	11 Wheel	10 Chariot	10 Chariot
9 Fortitude	10 Chariot	9 Chariot	9 Chariot	10 Chariot	10 Chariot	9 Wheel	
8 Justice	9 Wheel	8 Love	8 Justice	9 Fortitude			
7 Temperance	8 Justice	7 Justice	7 Fortitude	8 Justice			
6 Chariot	7 Fortitude	6 Fortitude	6 Temperance	7 Temperance			
5 Love	6 Temperance	5 Temperance	5 Love	6 Love	6 Love		
Pope	5 Love	4 Constancy	? 4 Pope	5 Pope	5 Sultan		
Popess	4 Eastern Emperor	3 Emperor	3 Emperor	4 Emperor			
Emperor	3 Western Emperor	2 Empress		3 Empress			
Empress	2 'Grand Duke'	1 Bagatto		2 Popess			
Bagatto	1 Bagatto	Poverty		1 Bagatto			

TYPE A

In orders of type B, something completely different happens. In these, the World is the highest trump, and Justice is promoted to the second highest position in the sequence, coming immediately below the World and above the Angel, the third highest card. There is clearly here an association of ideas: the Angel proclaims the last Judgment, at which justice will be dispensed. In orders of type B, Temperance always comes immediately above the Pope, and is separated from Fortitude, which comes three cards later, after Love and the Chariot. There is very little variation in these orders: the Popess does not have a stable position, and, in the Steele MS., the positions of Love and the Chariot have been reversed.

Type B has by far the best literary attestation, namely in three out of our four sources, including the earliest one, the Steele MS. The other two are Garzoni and the Bertoni poem, which give exactly the same type B order. The type is also exemplified by the Metropolitan Museum pack, and, incomplete as it is, by the Rouen pack. The isolated card at Rome, Love, numbered 8, probably also comes from a pack with a type B order, although this cannot be certain, there being one type A order, that of the Tarocco Siciliano, in which Love bears the number 8.

Steele MS.	*Garzoni & Bertoni*	*Metrop. Mus.*	*Rouen*
21 World	World	World	
20 Justice	Justice	20 Justice	
19 Angel	Angel	19 Angel	
18 Sun	Sun	18 Sun	
17 Moon	Moon	?17 Moon	
16 Star	Star	or ?16 Star	16 Star
15 Tower	Tower	15 Tower	
14 Devil	Devil	14 Devil	14 Devil
13 Death	Death	13 Death	
12 Hanged Man	Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	
11 Hermit	Hermit	11 Hermit	11 Hermit
10 Wheel	Wheel	10 Wheel	10 Wheel
9 Fortitude	Fortitude	? ?Fortitude	
8 Chariot	Love	8 Love	
7 Love	Chariot	? Chariot	7 Chariot
6 Temperance	Temperance	6 Temperance	
5 Pope	Pope	5 ?Pope	5 Pope
4 Popess	Popess	4 ?Emperor	4 Emperor
3 Emperor	Emperor	3 Popess	
2 Empress	Empress	2 ?Empress	
1 Bagatto	Bagatto	? ?Bagatto	

TYPE B

We have only one certain attestation to an order of type C as being used in Italy before the eighteenth century, namely Susio's poem. If we knew nothing of non-Italian Tarot cards, or of the post-1700 Lombard and Piedmontese patterns, we might dismiss type C as a minor curiosity; but, as the type to which not only the Tarot de Marseille order, but all those used outside Italy, belong, it is of course of great importance. Susio's order is considerably different from that of the Tarot de Marseille; it is, in fact, almost precisely the order found in Viévil's pack, save for the relative order of the Empress and Popess. In an order of type C, the World is again the highest card in the sequence, but, this time, the Angel comes immediately below it. Of the Virtues, it is Temperance that is promoted to a relatively high position, namely to just above Death and just below the Devil; any symbolic appropriateness in this escapes me. The remaining two Virtues are again separated and scattered within the middle segment, Justice in all cases coming lower. In Viévil's and Susio's orders, Justice comes just above the first card of the middle segment, Love, and Fortitude just above the next one, the Chariot. In the Tarot de Marseille, Justice comes above the first two cards of the middle segment, Love and the Chariot, and Fortitude above the next two, the Hermit and the Wheel. The single trump card, the World, numbered XXI, from the Castello Sforzesco set, in itself of course indicates no more than that the order was of type B or type C.

It will be remembered, in connection with the following table, that, in Viévil's pack, as in those of de Hautot and of the anonymous Parisian cardmaker, as well as in the Belgian Tarot, trump XVI is actually called the Lightning and does not show a tower; nor does that by Catelin Geoffroy, though we do not know what name it bore. The order in the anonymous Parisian pack coincides with that of the Tarot de Marseille; so do those of the Tarot de Besançon and of the Belgian Tarot, save for the difference of subjects on trumps II and V. With the same reservation, the order in de Hautot's pack coincides with that given by the *Maison académique*. It is apparent from the table that the order in Catelin Geoffroy's pack, unless very eccentric, must have been that of the Tarot de Marseille; virtually the only alternative is that the Wheel was numbered VIII and Justice and Fortitude X and XI, which is quite unlikely.

While literally true, it is somewhat misleading to say that ten or eleven distinct orders were known in Italy before the eighteenth century. The variations within type B are very minor ones. Those within type A are more considerable: but

Susio	*Viévil*	*Geoffroy*	*T. de Marseille*	*Maison acad.*
World	21 World		21 World	21 World
Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel
Sun	19 Sun		19 Sun	19 Sun
Moon	18 Moon		18 Moon	18 Moon
Star	17 Star		17 Star	17 Star
Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower
Devil	15 Devil		15 Devil	15 Devil
Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance
Death	13 Death	13 Death	13 Death	13 Death
Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man
Hermit	11 Hermit		11 Fortitude	11 Fortitude
Wheel	10 Wheel		10 Wheel	10 Wheel
Fortitude	9 Fortitude	9 Hermit	9 Hermit	9 Hermit
Chariot	8 Chariot		8 Justice	8 Justice
Justice	7 Justice	7 Chariot	7 Chariot	7 Chariot
Love	6 Love		6 Love	6 Love
Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope
Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Empress
Popess	3 Empress	3 Empress	3 Empress	3 Emperor
Empress	2 Popess	2 Popess	2 Popess	2 Popess
Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto

TYPE C

if we set aside the Tarocco Siciliano, in which we know that some dislocation occurred, the major deviation is seen to occur in the Bolognese order, in which the Virtues are placed after the Chariot instead of before it; for the rest, the variations within this type are, so far as we know, again comparatively minor. We may thus regard Italian Tarot players of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries as having observed three, or perhaps four, distinct basic orderings of the trumps, with small variations from one area to another.

So far we have paid no attention to the numbering of the trumps; it might be thought that this followed automatically from their order, but this is not so. If we study the various numberings, we find very little in the way of any close association of numbers with particular subjects. Almost the only such association is that of the number 13 with Death. Even that is not invariable: but it occurs more frequently than the association of a particular number with any other card, even that of the number 1 with the Bagatto. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the cardmakers, or those for whose tastes they were catering, regarded this association as particularly appropriate, and strove to arrange for it. Even today, some superstition attaches to this card among certain card players: a student who played French Tarot with lorry drivers in France, using a Tarot de Marseille pack, reported that they considered it bad luck to be dealt trump XIII, and would not, in such an event, enter the bidding, however strong a hand they otherwise had.

Now if one has the trumps arranged in an order of type A, and begins the numbering with the lowest trump, Death receives the number 14. This can be seen from the Rosenwald pack, where the numbering stops at 12: if it had been continued, the number 14 would be assigned to Death. It is probable that this consequence was accepted in the alla Colonna pack; it must have been accepted if the order in that pack was truly of type A, and none of the cards of the middle segment was promoted above Death. But there was a solution which allowed Death to be assigned the number 13 in an ordering of type A, and this can be seen from the Tarocco Bolognese. In the Tarocco Bolognese, only trumps 5 to 16 are numbered: but if the numbering is continued, it will only reach 20; the Moon will become no. 17, the Sun no. 18, the World no. 19 and the Angel no. 20. This is because Love, as no. 5, has, not four, but five cards below it. We could not number the Moors, because they are all equal: but, if they were numbered, they would occupy positions 1 to 4, leaving no number for the Bagatto, which would thus have to be regarded as an unnumbered card ranking below the numbered ones, like the *Miseria* in the Tarocco Siciliano.

We can see that the principle of starting the numbering with the second lowest trump, followed in the Tarocco Siciliano and, in a concealed fashion, in the Tarocco Bolognese, also underlies the numbering of the Charles VI trumps. In that numbering, the Angel holds the highest place, and has the number 20. There is no other card which could possibly rank above it as no. 21: the World is numbered 19, and Justice is numbered 8. On the assumption that the Popess and the Empress were present to occupy between them the positions numbered 1 and 2, the numbering must have begun after the Bagatto, in order to bring Death out as no. 13. The numbering of the Catania cards provides another example.

The Orfeo pack presumably supplies yet another instance of the practice: there can hardly be any cards other than the five unnumbered ones to rank above the highest-numbered one, the 15, so that, to have a full complement of twenty-one trumps, there must be nine cards below the lowest-numbered one surviving in any of the packs, the 9. If the Orfeo packs are representative of the type of 78-card pack from which the Minchiate pack was derived, there are two possibilities. The sequence may have continued down from 8 to 3 as in the Minchiate pack, with 4 and 3 as the two Emperors, and then have had two corresponding Empresses as nos. 2 and 1, and, below them, an unnumbered Bagatto. Alternatively, it may have run from 8 down to 1 exactly as in the Minchiate pack, the Bagatto thus being numbered 1, and have had some unnumbered card ranking below the Bagatto like the *Miseria* of the Tarocco Siciliano. Of these two possibilities, the former seems a little more likely; but yet others are thinkable, and it would throw great light on the history of the Italian Tarocco pack in the seventeenth century if a complete Orfeo pack were to be discovered.

In orders of types B and C, one of the Virtues – Justice in type B and Temperance in type C – is promoted higher than Death, with the result that, when all the trumps are numbered in sequence from the Bagatto up, Death comes out as no. 13, without the necessity for any special device to secure this result. In consequence, we never find a trump sequence of either of these types that leaves the Bagatto unnumbered and starts the numbering with the next card. It is for this reason that it has been possible to classify the incomplete Rouen set as exemplifying type B. In the Rouen pack, the Star is numbered 16. If the pack is at all like others that are known, there are only two possible explanations of this. Either only four cards rank above the Star, in which case the numbering must start with the card above the Bagatto; or five cards rank above the Star, and, in that case, one of them must be Justice. The former possibility seems, in the Rouen pack, to be ruled out by the fact that the Pope and Emperor are numbered 5 and 4 respectively.

We have now to enquire in which areas the different orders were observed; and we must use whatever clues we can extract from the four sets of late fifteenth-century wood-block printed sheets for popular Tarot packs, numbered (21) to (24) in Chapter 4. Just as there is a temptation to say, at first glance, that there was no fixed order for the trumps in Italy before the eighteenth century, so there is the parallel temptation to say that no standard pattern was adopted for the Tarot pack, because, among the early cards that survive, one can scarcely find two sets exhibiting the same type of design. This temptation is equally to be resisted. We have seen it to be a universal law, applying to Indian and Chinese cards as much as to European ones, that in any locality any specific type of playing-card pack very rapidly assumes a stereotyped design to which all cardmakers conform, for the simple reason that players need to be able to recognise each card at a glance. There is no ground whatever to suppose that the Tarot pack was any exception to this rule. The variations in design that we can observe amongst surviving cards are to be explained in the same way as those between different orders of the trumps subjects, namely as representing different standard patterns used in different regions. This does not, of course, apply to the hand-painted packs, which were luxury items, nor to obviously non-standard packs such as the Rouen one or the Sola-Busca *tarocchi*: but, though we can never with certainty identify a design as a standard pattern when we have only one example of it, it is highly probable that each of our four sets of sheets (21) to (24) exemplifies one of the standard patterns in use towards the end of the fifteenth century in some particular locality. We must therefore investigate whether it is possible to identify the areas in which those standard patterns were used, simultaneously with our enquiry into the regional associations of the various trump orders.

The easiest set of sheets with which to start is the pair divided between the École des Beaux Arts and the Rothschild Collection (no. 23).

Detlef Hoffmann describes these as Minchiate cards, and W.L. Schreiber, presumably with the same idea in mind, assigns them to Florence; Stuart Kaplan characteristically hedges his bet, describing them as 'Tarot or Minchiate cards'.[15] Hoffmann mentions, only to reject, an identification of them by Sylvia Mann as Tarocchino cards; but a comparison between them and a modern Tarocco Bolognese pack will at once bear her out, revealing striking correspondences in design. If, instead, the comparison is made with the seventeenth-century standard single-ended Tarocco Bolognese in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the designs will be found to tally in almost every detail; the one exception is the Devil, the design of which on the Rothschild sheet is completely different from that of the later Tarocco Bolognese. The resemblance between the seventeenth-century pack and set no. (23) is overwhelmingly close in the cases of the Angel, the World, the Sun, the Moon, the Star, the Tower, the Hermit and the Chariot; note particularly the rayed arcs which appear in the upper corners of several cards in both packs. Death in the later pack faces the opposite way, but is otherwise similar, down to the band at the top of the card, save for the position of the horse's head. The direction of motion of the Wheel, and a few other details, differ in the later card, but they are still fairly similar. The arms of the Traitor or Hanged Man of the later pack differ from those of the earlier one in being bound behind him, instead of hanging down grasping money bags. It is only in the design of this last card in set no. (23) that there is any similarity with Minchiate cards, whereas, on the eight cards singled out above, detail after detail corresponds exactly with the Bolognese cards. This is not, indeed, to endorse Miss Mann's characterisation of these as Tarocchino cards, since the use of this term presupposes that the pack had already been shortened to 62 cards, and this, of course, we cannot judge from twelve surviving trumps; on the whole, it is probable that the shortening had not yet taken place. But we can confidently assign set (23) to Bologna, and conclude that the standard pattern used there from the seventeenth century to the present day was already in existence by the end of the fifteenth century. It will be recalled that the single sixteenth-century unnumbered Devil card by Agnolo Hebreo in the British Museum (no. 27 above) resembles that on the Rothschild sheet, and is therefore presumably also to be assigned to Bologna: the change in the design of this card must have occurred between the mid-sixteenth and the mid-seventeenth century.

The next in order of difficulty is the Rosenwald set (no. 22 of Chapter 4). This is certainly not a Minchiate pack, since it has only twenty-one trumps. But, although the Swords are curved, it has several Minchiate characteristics: (i) the *Cavalli*, in all four suits, are centaurs, like those in Swords and Batons in the Minchiate pack; (ii) the lowest court figures in Cups and Coins are Maids, while those in Swords and Batons are Jacks; and (iii) the Kings in Swords and Batons wear short tunics, those in Cups and Coins long robes. It is true that there is no close relation between the designs for the trump cards and the corresponding ones of the Minchiate pack, save for a noticeable similarity in the case of the Hermit and the Hanged Man; but the order of the trumps is of type A, nearly, though not quite, corresponding to that of the Minchiate trumps when the twenty additional ones are removed (the positions of Fortitude and Justice, and, apparently, those of the Chariot and the Wheel, are reversed). It therefore seems probable that the set represents an early form of that standard pattern for the Tarot pack on which the Minchiate designs were later based, or some closely related pattern. The Rosenwald sheets are thus very likely to have been made in Florence (or possibly in some other city of Tuscany such as Pistoia).[16]

The type A orders are associated with Florence (by the Minchiate and Orfeo packs, and, on the basis of its resemblance to the former, by the Rosenwald one); with Rome (by the alla Colonna pack, which was certainly made there, and also by the Minchiate pack, which was popular there, though it originated in Florence); with Sicily; and of course with Bologna. The Charles VI and Catania packs were probably made in Ferrara, but this does not help us, since in both cases the numbering was added later, presumably by an owner of the cards, and we do not know their early history. The Charles VI numbering does show, however, that type A orders go back to the fifteenth century, and the Rosenwald pack takes us back to the same date (or possibly a little later, since it could be from the early years of the sixteenth century). We know by documentary evidence that Tarot cards were in use in Bologna in 1459; of course, we do not know what order was there observed for the trump cards at that date, but, in view of the intense conservatism of Bolognese players, it seems more probable than not that it was already of type A. Type A thus had an early origin; as shown by the alla Colonna and Orfeo packs, it lasted through the seventeenth century, and survives, in the Tarocco Bolognese and the Tarocco Siciliano, down to the present day. The Sicilian pack provides further evidence that type A orders were observed in Rome, since it was probably from Rome that the 78-card pack was introduced into Sicily in 1663, together with the Minchiate pack. It may not have been until the later fifteenth century that the game of Tarot reached Florence, and it was almost certainly from there that both Minchiate and the 78-card game travelled to Rome, probably some time in the course of the sixteenth century. Florence is thus likely to have been the place of ultimate origin of all those type A orders other than that observed in Bologna (which, as noted, differs from the others in placing the Chariot below the Virtues). Although we have no direct evidence to this effect, it is also probable that some type A order travelled to Piedmont by at least the seventeenth century; on no other hypothesis is it intelligible that, after the reintroduction of the 78-card pack from France, Piedmontese players should have insisted on treating the Angel as ranking higher than the World.

---

[15] D. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 66; W.L. Schreiber, *Die ältesten Spielkarten*, Strasbourg, 1937, p. 104; S.R. Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 128-9.

[16] The statutes of Pistoia exempt *triumphi* and a game called *la diricta* from the general prohibition on card games (*Statuta Pistoriensium libri septem*, Florence, 1579, Lib. V, rubrica LX, p. 152). Whether the word *triumphi* refers to Tarot or to a game with the regular pack is unclear. 1579 is very late for the use of the word in the former sense, but the statute may be much older than the collection; it is repeated, word for word, in the *Leges Municipales Pistoriensium nuper mandante serenissimo Cosmo III Magno Duce*, Florence, 1682, p. 210.

We have now to consider the orders of type B. In the only other set of early popular Tarot cards in which the trumps are numbered, the sheets at the Metropolitan Museum (no. 21 in Chapter 4), the order is of type B. This is the only set of early Tarot cards that has stylistic affinities to any surviving regular cards. There are two sheets (I-1009 and I-1010) in the Cary Collection at Yale University, evidently for the same pack, no cards being duplicated on the two sheets. In an article about them written in 1939,[17] Cary illustrated them, together with other copies from the Magyar Nemzeti Museum in Budapest, which I have been told are no longer there, and of which he stated that duplicates (which I have not seen) were sold to the Metropolitan Museum in New York in 1922. By comparison of Cary's sheets and those at Budapest, it can be seen that together they made up a complete regular pack of 48 cards (that is to say, without the 10s). The three sheets of the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack include no numeral cards of any of the suits, but they have three Kings, three Queens, all four *Cavalli* and two Jacks. The Kings from the two packs are highly similar, though not identical: in both they wear short tunics and sit beneath arches. The *Cavallo* of Batons (not quite complete in the Budapest sheet) appears to be identical in the two packs, a rather curious design in which the mounted knight holds the open-mouthed head of some animal. The *Cavallo* of Coins is quite different: on the Budapest sheet, the knight appears to be riding an ostrich, whereas, in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, he is mounted more conventionally on a horse, and holds one coin while another is at his horse's feet. Not enough of the other two *Cavalli* on the Cary/Budapest sheets can be seen to be sure how far they resemble the Metropolitan Museum ones. The Jack of Cups on the Cary sheet is identical with that in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack: he is drinking from a cup held in his left hand, and carries a pipe in his right hand. The Jacks of Swords in the two packs are, however, quite unlike: that on the Cary sheet is in the act of sheathing his sword, while the Metropolitan Museum one bears his upright.

Other early Italian cards survive having close affinities with these two packs. In the Benaki Museum at Athens there is a 3 of Cups identical with that shown on I-1010, and therefore probably from an identical pack; it appears to have been discovered in Egypt, and hence to be from an Italian pack exported there during the Mamlūk period.[18] Also in the Cary Collection is another sheet (I-1008), discussed by Cary in his 1939 article, and again with another copy then in Budapest and with a duplicate in the Metropolitan Museum. This is not a sheet for the same pack, the sizes of the cards being different, and the sword on the Ace of Swords being held by a lion instead of by a human hand as on I-1010; but there are close similarities. I-1008 shows only numeral cards, of Swords and Batons, and includes 10s of both suits. Finally, there are four sheets, all for the same pack, in the Fournier Museum in Vitoria (no. 1 in the Italian section of the catalogue). Although a few cards are damaged, they together make up a virtually complete regular pack, again of only 48 cards. The Kings are again highly similar both to those on I-1009 and to those in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, without being identical with either; the Jacks and *Cavalli* bear no resemblance to those of the other two packs; the Ace of Swords seems to be identical with that on I-1010, and those of Batons and Cups highly similar.

---

[17] Melbert B. Cary, Jr., 'A stencil sheet of playing cards of the late 15th century with two related uncut sheets of cards', *The Print Collectors' Quarterly*, vol. 26, 1939, pp. 392-423.

[18] See M. Dummett, 'A note on some fragments in the Benaki Museum', *Art and Archaeology Research Papers (AARP)*, no. 4, December 1973, pp. 93-9.

There are two distinctive features on the numeral cards of Swords and Batons in all these packs, save for the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, of which, as remarked, no numeral cards survive. In all three of the other packs, the Swords, though curved (save for the odd straight one) and mostly extending the length of the card, are arranged so as not to intersect, being concave towards the nearest edge of the card; on the higher-numbered cards, one or more swords are often placed horizontally at top or bottom. On I-1008 and in the Fournier pack, the swords are encircled by a crown; on I-1010, they are tied together by a scarf. In all three packs, the numeral cards of the Batons suit bear a scroll on which is written in full the number of the card. The pack in the Fournier Museum is dated 1462 in the first edition of the catalogue, but this is presumably due to a misreading of the scroll on the 2 of Batons, which should probably be read *duobs*: on I-1008 the form used is *duobs*, and on I-1009 *duos*. A safer dating would seem to be 1490-1510.

The similarities between all four packs, including the Tarot pack at the Metropolitan Museum, imply an origin from the same locality; and the use of identical designs for some of the cards in different packs must surely indicate that they all came from the same studio, one employing a selection of alternative designs for the court cards and Aces. In his article, Cary proposes Venice as the place of origin of the three sheets he is discussing. He quotes the Budapest museum as describing their copies as Venetian, and cites two authorities on prints, Campbell Dodgson and Franz Schubert, as concurring with his attribution of them to Venice; the catalogue of the Fournier Museum also assigns the pack there to Venice. The only reason given for this attribution by any of these writers is, however, one advanced by Cary himself, namely that the form *diexe* used for the word 'ten' on the 10 of Batons of I-1008 belongs to the Venetian dialect, the modern Venetian form, in use at least by the sixteenth century, being *diese*. Though linguistic evidence of this kind is perfectly valid, it would be pleasant to have a broader basis for the attribution, especially as some of the linguistic forms used seem distinctly odd (one cannot in general expect very accurate spelling from cardmakers). In default of any other evidence, however, we may resonably fall in with the prevailing opinion, and agree in regarding all these packs as Venetian; it is very plausible that the pack exported to Egypt, from which the Benaki card comes, should have been made in Venice.

We may thus tentatively assign the Metropolitan Museum pack, no. (21), to Venice, and regard it as exemplifying, if not exactly a standard pattern, at least a general style of Tarot pack in use there at the end of the fifteenth century. There is a curiously persistent tradition in the literature on playing cards of referring to 78-card Italian Tarot packs as 'Venetian Tarots', as distinguished from Bolognese Tarots and 'Florentine Tarots', i.e. Minchiate packs; often the term 'Venetian Tarots' is applied even to packs made in or after the eighteenth century with designs derived from the Tarot de Marseille.[19] Venice is definitely not among the places in which the game of Tarot was played after its reintroduction from France in the eighteenth century, and there is no clear evidence that it was ever very popular there in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, so the tradition of speaking of 'Venetian Tarots' is a thoroughly misleading one; in the Metropolitan Museum sheets we have the one example of a popular pack that may plausibly be described as a Venetian Tarot.

---

[19] The latest to follow this tradition is Mr Stuart R. Kaplan, op. cit. On p. 49, under the heading 'Tarocchi of Venice', he speaks, rather oddly, of 'the so-called Tarocchi of Venice or Lombard pack ... more commonly known as Piedmontese tarot', and illustrates this type on p. 48 with a pack in the Fournier Museum made in Gorizia, captioning it 'Piedmontese or Tarocchi of Venice Cards'. The pack is no. 12 in the Italian section of the Fournier catalogue, where it is also described as 'tarocchi de Venecia' and assigned the

We have now established one tentative association of the type B orders, namely with Venice. This is corroborated by the Rouen pack, which also has the trumps arranged in a type B order, and has also been associated with Venice.[20] There remain the three literary references. Unfortunately, I know no way of assigning a geographical origin to the Steele MS. volume of sermons. Tomaso Garzoni's *Piazza Universale* was published in Venice, but that is not very significant, since Venice was a great publishing centre. He himself, though he studied law at Ferrara and Siena before joining the Lateran Congregation in 1566, was a native of Bagnacavallo, near Ravenna, and also died there. As for the Bertoni *tarocchi appropriati*, they relate to the ladies of the court of Ferrara. Ferrara was never within the Venetian dominions, though it was very close to their border; but the Sola-Busca *tarocchi*, made by a Ferrarese artist but dated from the foundation of the city of Venice, testify to a link between the traditions of Tarot play in the two cities. Ferrara was, of course, one of the principal centres where the game of Tarot was played in the early period, and very likely the birthplace of the game; the Bertoni poem provides incontrovertible evidence that the type B order prevailed there. It seems quite possible, therefore, that the type of design exemplified by the Metropolitan Museum sheets, which we have assigned to Venice, was equally characteristic of Ferrara; indeed, we should keep open the possibility that those sheets are not from Venice but from Ferrara. In any case, it seems safe to assign type B orders to Venice as well as to Ferrara, and they probably prevailed in the whole of Emilia except for the city of Bologna. On the evidence of the Steele sermon, type B orders go back to at least about 1470-80; since they are associated with Ferrara, they quite possibly go back to the original invention of the Tarot pack. On the evidence of Garzoni's book, they lasted until at least the late sixteenth century.

That leaves us with the type C order and the Cary *tarocchi* sheet, no. (24) of Chapter 4. Susio's poem, which is our only source for type C orders in Italy, concerned the ladies of the court of Pavia.[21] This city was in the dominions of both the Visconti and Sforza dukes of Milan, who styled themselves Princes of Pavia and for whom it was a second capital; it contains a great Visconti castle, begun by Galeazzo II and completed by Giangaleazzo Visconti, who also founded the Carthusian monastery near Pavia and began the building of Pavia's Cathedral, and was the first to bear the title of Duke of Milan. We may therefore reasonably assume that it was a type C order which prevailed not only at Pavia but at Milan, the second great early centre, after Ferrara, for the game of Tarot. Now despite the variations that occurred, all the trump orderings used by French and Swiss cardmakers were of type C. If we had no evidence that an order of this type was ever used in Italy before the eighteenth century, we should most naturally infer that it was invented in France or Switzerland. But, as it is, we are forced to conclude that either the French or the Swiss, or both independently, picked it up from Italy. Even if we did not know of Viévil's pack, the occurrence in both Susio's trump order and in the Tarot de Marseille of the intrinsically rather implausible placing of Temperance between Death and the Devil would seem unlikely to be a coincidence. Indeed, this is another case in which a conjecture made in the original version of this book received additional confirmation while it was in proof: for the almost exact agreement between Viévil's trump order and that given by

---

date 1650; Kaplan more cautiously says 'circa late 17th to mid-18th century'. It has inscriptions in French, and represents that adaptation of the Tarot de Marseille used in Lombardy, but made in a wide range of areas, different from the adaptation characteristic of Piedmont; it can hardly be earlier than 1740.

[20] See Pompeo Molmenti, *La Storia di Venezia nella vita privata*, vol. II, Bergamo, 1906, p. 525. Francesco Novati, on p. 19, fn. 1, of the first of his articles cited in footnote 22, expresses the same opinion. How well founded it is, I am not sure.

[21] In my earlier discussion of this subject, 'The Order of the Tarot Trumps', *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. II, no. 3, February 1974, pp. 1-17, no. 4, May 1974, pp. 33-50, I made the mistake, for which I cannot now account, of saying that the Susio poem was about the ladies of the court of Mantua. S.R. Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 30, 373, also cites Susio's poem, though he gives no reference, and also makes the same error; possibly mine was the source of his.

Susio, presumably used in Milan in the sixteenth century, converts a plausible hypothesis into a certainty. The modification of the Milanese order which resulted in that used in the Tarot de Marseille had obviously occurred by the mid-sixteenth century, without gaining universal acceptance in France for another hundred years: whether it originated in France, in Switzerland or even in Milan it is hard to judge.

If the French and Swiss did pick up the type C order in Italy, by far the likeliest place for them to have done so is Milan. Charles VIII of France invaded Italy in 1494, originally on the invitation of Lodovico Sforza (il Moro), Duke of Milan. Louis XII, the grandson of Valentina Visconti, claimed Milan by right of succession, and launched a second invasion in 1499; the city was then under French rule until 1512, when Louis was defeated at Novara by an alliance which included the Swiss. Up to 1515, when Francis I secured their exclusive services, Swiss mercenaries played a prominent role in these wars; and from 1512 to 1515, Duke Massimiliano Sforza was maintained in power by Swiss arms. In 1515 the French, under Francis I, again invaded Italy, defeated the Swiss at Marignano, and once more occupied Milan until 1522. Especially during the reign of Francis I (1515-1547), there was a great vogue in France, centring upon Lyons, for Italian culture. The period of the French incursions into Italy, from 1494 to 1525, may therefore well have been the time when the game of Tarot first entered France. It may have reached Switzerland independently in the same period, for, as we saw in Chapter 10, certain details of Swiss Tarot play suggest a direct derivation of the game from Italy. If this is true, of France alone or of both France and Switzerland, it must surely have been a Milanese style of Tarot game, and a Milanese version of the Tarot pack, that were adopted; with them would naturally go the order of the trumps observed in Milan. If the game of *triumphe* played by Duke René II of Lorraine in 1496 were truly one played with the Tarot pack, his knowledge of the game may have been due to his contact with the Swiss, with whose help he had achieved his great victory in 1477 outside the walls of Nancy against Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, who was killed in the battle. Even if this is so, the adoption in the sixteenth century of the French version *tarots* of the new term *tarocchi* argues a continued contact with Italy in the domain of card play as in other spheres.

On this theory, then, a type C trump order, and, specifically, that given by Susio, was in use in Milan; and it was from Milan that the French, and probably the Swiss, first learned the game of Tarot. They must, therefore, originally have used whatever type of design was standard in Milan: but we cannot immediately deduce what this was, since, as we saw in Chapter 9, there were two distinct traditions of design for the Tarot pack in the French-speaking lands, one culminating in the Belgian Tarot and the other in the Tarot de Marseille. We have, however, still to determine the geographical origin of the sheet in the Cary collection (no. 24). After what has gone before, this affords us very little difficulty, because of the close resemblance of certain of the cards, despite their lack of numerals or other inscriptions, to those of the Tarot de Marseille. Specifically, the Sun (of which the left-hand part is missing) is, so far as can be seen, exactly like its Tarot de Marseille counterpart; a small naked boy is to be seen at the bottom of the card, the sun has a face and rays and sheds the characteristic Tarot de Marseille droplets. The Chariot, incomplete at the top, is likewise, so far as can be seen, exactly like that of the Tarot de Marseille. The Moon resembles the Tarot de Marseille one, save that there are no dogs, and the buildings are much smaller: there is the same pool with a lobster or crab in it in the foreground. The Tower again has a close similarity to the Tarot de Marseille *Maison Dieu*: round thunderbolts are falling about a round, bricked tower, though no lightning is apparent. The Star resembles the Tarot de Marseille one in general conception, though not in detail: a very large star, surrounded by four smaller ones, shines on a naked girl pouring water into a stream. The Emperor has the same general pose and appearance as in the Tarot de Marseille, though the positions of his shield and sceptre are different. The Bagatto has the same posture as the Tarot de Marseille one, though he does not face in the same direction, and his hat and table are differently shaped. The Love card, of which only the lower half survives, is particularly interesting. Only two figures can be seen, corresponding perhaps to the left-hand and central figures of the Tarot de Marseille card: but they are highly reminiscent of the couple on the corresponding card in the Visconti di

Modrone pack (no. 1 in Chapter 4). The Wheel of Fortune, another card whose top half is missing, has the same orientation, and the same handle, as in the Tarot de Marseille; and the Empress, though again with shield and sceptre reversed, has the same chair-back that, on several cards, keeps threatening, in Tarot de Marseille derivatives, to turn into a pair of wings. Not much can be seen of the Fool, save that, as in the Tarot de Marseille, he is striding off to the right, a staff over his shoulder; no dog is to be seen, however. The two suit cards, the 7 and 8 (or 9) of Batons, are exactly like those of the Tarot de Marseille, save for the lack of inscribed numerals; the Batons have just the same flat appearance, with widened ends, found both in the Tarot de Marseille and in Viévil's pack. Other cards, however, have little or no similarity to their Tarot de Marseille counterparts: Temperance, the Devil, Fortitude and the Popess (on this sheet, a Bishopess); of the Pope, not enough can be seen to be sure.

These resemblances cannot possibly be coincidence: it is evident that the French cardmakers borrowed these designs, which thus became ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille pattern. It follows that the origin of the Tarot de Marseille goes right back to the first introduction of the Tarot pack into France, and perhaps also into Switzerland, around the beginning of the sixteenth century. It also follows that we can firmly identify the Cary sheet as being from Milan, and hence as exemplifying the standard pattern employed in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century for popular Tarot packs in the city from which came the finest of the early hand-painted cards; that city where, as we have argued, the French and probably also the Swiss first encountered the game of Tarot and took it back with them to their home countries. This hypothesis fits well with the fact that the trumps on the Cary sheet are unnumbered. It was stated earlier that, of all the literary references, only the Steele sermon assigns numbers to the trumps, but this was not strictly accurate: the lines of the Susio poem are also numbered, but in the reverse order, the World being numbered 1, the Angel 2 and so on. This is the most explicit testimony possible to the fact that the trumps of the pack in which this type C order was used were *not* numbered: if they had been, it is inconceivable that the poem could have given the numbering in the reverse order. In whichever form of pack the ordering of the trumps given by Susio was employed, the players accustomed to play with it must have had to memorise the trump sequence, just as the Bolognese ones had to do. Because of the affinities which both the trump order and the designs of the Cary sheet have to the cards used in France, it is highly probable that the kind of pack for which the type C order was used was that of which the Cary sheet is an instance.

These conclusions are corroborated by the set of six Tarot cards (no. 29 above) found at the Castello Sforzesco in Milan during the restoration work of 1908, and by others found there at the same time; again, these were not known to me in detail until this book was in proof, and provided strong confirmation of the hypotheses set out above concerning Milan. The cards found at the Castello were cursorily described by Francesco Novati in two articles of 1908.[22] His datings tend to be uniformly too early. He considered all the cards to date from the fifteenth, sixteenth or seventeenth century, whereas some demonstrably exemplify the eighteenth-century Lombard variation on the Tarot de Marseille. One such example is a set of five cards (Cavallo of Swords, torn at the bottom, 5 and 7 of Coins, and 6 and 8 of Swords, the last four all having Roman numerals at the sides) made by the cardmaker who used the trade-name 'Al Soldato' and operated in Bologna during the eighteenth century. Another is a Cavallo of Batons, bearing a legible French inscription at the bottom. There is also a set of three cards, which appear to have been trimmed at top and bottom, and are probably from a French Tarot de Marseille pack of the Revolutionary period: they consist of the Sun, numbered XVIIII, the lower inscription having been trimmed off, the Cavalier of Cups, of which the same is true, and the 4 of Swords, with Roman numerals at the sides. There are also a 10 of Coins, with the trade-name 'Al Leone' on the back, and a 5 of Cups, with the trade-name 'Al Mondo'; both these names signify other Bolognese cardmakers of the eighteenth century.

However, besides the set of six *tarocchi* classified as no. (29) above, there are also other cards evidently dating from before the eighteenth century, none of which we have any reason to regard as being from a Tarot pack. Just as in Bologna the same standard pattern was used for the regular Primiera pack and for the suit cards of the Tarocco pack, so the same may well have been true in Milan. One of these earlier cards is a 5 of Batons, exhibiting the usual flat shape, with widened ends, of Tarot de Marseille Batons, but without numerals, but only floral decoration, at the sides. Another is a much damaged Cavallo (of Swords?), not coinciding in design with any known standard Tarot pattern. This may come from the same pack as the 5 of Batons, but from both the back design has peeled off; they may be of the sixteenth or seventeenth century. A set of nineteen cards, some very fragmentary, all of the same size (102 x 69 mm.) and presumably by the same maker, though not from the same pack, is assigned by Novati to sixteenth-century Venice. The back of each card depicts a classical deity, whose name is inscribed on a scroll; nine different deities appear on different cards. Each back design is surrounded by a wide border with lozenge-shaped dots, which fold over to form a border for the face of the card.[23] Of these, fourteen are numeral cards, of all four suits; in every case, they tally precisely in design with the corresponding cards of the Tarot de Marseille, save that they lack Roman numerals at the sides. The remaining five, all fragmentary, are court cards. They are: the top half of a King (of Batons?), the back showing SATURNO; the top half of a Jack (of Coins?) and the bottom half of a Jack (of Cups?), both backs showing PROSERPINA; and the top half of a Cavallo of Cups and the bottom half of a Jack of uncertain suit, both backs showing IOVE. These court cards do not show the same close correspondence with Tarot de Marseille designs. In particular, the Cavallo of Cups holds in his left hand a Cup shaped like that on the Tarot de Marseille Jack of that suit, instead of the Spanish-style Cup held in the right hand of the Cavalier in the Tarot de Marseille; while the King, who is bearded, holds, with his left hand, a Baton (or sceptre) over his left shoulder. Nevertheless, the Jack of which we have the top half wears the celebrated wide-brimmed hat found in the Tarot de Marseille on the Jacks of Coins and Swords and the Cavalier of Batons; and the King likewise wears the same hat surmounted by a crown, as do all four Kings in the Tarot de Marseille. These nineteen cards, from nine distinct packs, could be either of the sixteenth or of the seventeenth century. There seems no reason, however, to regard them as Venetian rather than Milanese; Swords and Batons on the numeral cards of the Venetian standard pattern, and on older cards assignable to Venice, have a different shape from those found here.

---

[22] Francesco Novati, 'Carte da giuoco dei secoli XV, XVI e XVII rinvenute nel Castello Sforzesco', *Bullettino dei civici musei artistico ed archeologico di Milano*, anno III, num. 3, 1908, pp. 17-20, and 'Per la storia delle carte da giuoco in Italia: appunti', *Il Libro e la Stampa*, anno II (n.s.), 1908, pp. 54-69; see pp. 65ff.

One of the oldest cards found at the Castello is a King of Cups of which, again, the top half is missing. The posture of the King resembles that of the King of Coins in the supposedly Spanish fifteenth-century pack which, in Chapter 2, we tentatively assigned to Naples, and, more generally, of several early German Kings; it may be of the early sixteenth or even of the fifteenth century. The most interesting of all the cards found at the Castello is a 2 of Coins which bears the scroll in the shape of an inverted S which, in Chapter 9, we noted as always occurring (sometimes not inverted) in Tarot de Marseille packs, and also in the pack of Jacques Viévil. As on the French cards, the scroll is inscribed with the maker's name and the date; the inscription reads PAVLINVS [DE] CASTELETO FECIT 1499. Novati cites documentary evidence of the presence in Milan in 1508 and 1513 of a cardmaker by the name of Paolino di Castelletto. There is no reason to regard Paolino's 2 of Coins, any more than the other cards just discussed, as having belonged to a Tarot pack: it nevertheless provides good evidence that a distinctive feature of French and Swiss Tarot card design was borrowed from Milan. The S-shaped feature is found to this day on the 2 of Coins in certain standard patterns for the Italian-suited regular pack, the Primiera Bolognese and Brescia patterns; in these however, it no longer has the character of a scroll; and does not bear the maker's name.

We have no pre-eighteenth-century Milanese example of the 2 of Cups, which is so distinctive of French Tarot packs, including Viévil's and de Hautot's as well as the Tarot de Marseille. But the curious and prominent feature of the two dragon-heads on the French versions of the card provide a particular reason for considering the design to have been derived from some very early prototype. As first remarked by Mr Jan

---

[23] Compare the backs of seventeenth-century Italian cards from the Correr Museum, Venice, shown by Hoffmann, op. cit., as plate 7b.

Bauwens, these dragon-heads have an extraordinary similarity to the dragon-heads in which certain of the suit-signs terminate on some cards of the Polo-Sticks suit in the Istanbul Mamlūk pack.[24] It looks as if we had here a detail, faithfully copied for centuries, that had originally been borrowed from Islamic cards; if so, the design of at least that particular card must go back to a period when Islamic cards were familiar to European players or cardmakers. This, too, fits very well with our conclusion that the designs on which the Tarot de Marseille was based were ones used in Milan, the birthplace of that Valentina Visconti whose inventory, upon her death in 1408, had listed *ung jeu de quartes sarrasines* along with *unes quartes de Lombardie*.[25]

One's first impression, looking at the various cards found at the Castello Sforzesco together, is of their uniformity of style. It would be a great mistake to suspect them for this reason of all dating from after 1700. The 2 of Coins by Paolino proves incontrovertibly that some are much older than that; and there is a clear criterion of distinction between post- and pre-eighteenth-century cards, the presence or absence of numerals on the numeral cards of the suits, and of names on the trumps and court cards. By this criterion, the set of six *tarocchi* is to be assigned to the earlier category, probably to the seventeenth century. What the cards found at the Castello together demonstrate is the absolute constancy of the Milanese designs for the numeral cards of the Italian-suited pack, and the equal constancy of the same designs as borrowed by the French cardmakers and employed in the Tarot de Marseille. If you ignore the inscription on Paolino's 2 of Coins, you might think that you were looking at an eighteenth-century card made in Marseilles. In the same way, apart from the absence of the Roman numerals at the sides, the numeral cards from the set of six *tarocchi*, those with classical deities on the backs, and the odd 5 of Batons are virtually indistinguishable from the eighteenth-century Lombard pattern. This may, at first sight, raise a doubt whether our original hypothesis, stated in Chapter 8, was after all correct, namely that the Lombard variant on the Tarot de Marseille signalised the reintroduction of the game of Tarot into Lombardy after a period in which it had been defunct there. Perhaps, we may now think, the Lombard pattern was a direct continuation of the standard pattern always used in Lombardy for Tarot cards, and for Italian-suited ones generally, and represented no more radical a change than a new vogue for putting names on the trump and court cards and numerals on the numeral cards. But reflection shows that we have no reason to doubt our original hypothesis. Whether that hypothesis is sound or unsound, the cards found at the Castello prove conclusively that the Tarot de Marseille designs for the numeral cards had faithfully preserved the Milanese prototypes on which they must have been modelled in the early sixteenth century, and that these same designs remained unchanged in Milan itself. Given this, a close resemblance between those made in pre-eighteenth-century Milan and those of the later Lombard pattern is precisely what we should expect, even if our hypothesis is true; that we find just such a resemblance is therefore no argument against that hypothesis. Our original ground for the hypothesis remains as suasive as ever, namely that, if inscriptions had been added to an existing pattern for a pack used to play a living game, they would have been in Italian; the fact that, for several decades, they remained in French clearly indicates that the Tarot de Marseille designs were being introduced from France; and that can have happened only if the indigenous tradition had, however little time before, died out. What the Cary sheet and the Castello Sforzesco cards make clear is that, in adopting a form of pack derived from the Tarot de Marseille, the players of *tarocchi* in Lombardy were welcoming home a descendant of the type of pack with which their ancestors had played, and a close relative of that used by their fathers.

---

[24] Jan Bauwens, *Mulūk wa Nuwwāb*, Aurelia Books, Leuven (Louvain), 1972, booklet issued with a reproduction of the Istanbul Mamlūk pack, pp. 36-7, figs. 8-11. (It should be noted that the reproduction pack is not a faithful copy of the original, but involves a good deal of 'reconstruction', to a large extent unsound: see the review by me in the *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. II, no. 2, November 1973, pp. 15-26. This does not, of course, affect the present point, which is a very interesting one.)

[25] F.M. Graves, *Deux inventaires de la Maison d'Orléans*, Paris, 1926, pp. 49, 134; see Chapter 3. On p. 84 it was strongly argued that the references to *triumphe* of 1482 and 1496 must relate to Tarot games. Such a hypothesis would contradict the idea that Tarot first entered France during the French occupation of Milan, since, as explained in footnote 2 to Chapter 9, the 1482 reference must concern a game played in France proper. But there is no difficulty in supposing the game to have spread to different parts of France at different times and by different routes; possibly it was the non-Milanese ancestor of the Paris/Rouen pattern that was the earlier arrival, and would have been used in 1482. If the game of 1482 was that played with the regular pack, the only reasonable hypothesis is that it also had an Italian origin, in which case an Italian game, involving trumps but played with the regular pack and known as *trionfi*, must have been in existence well before the end of the fifteenth century, and even longer before the earliest recorded use, in 1516, of the term *tarocchi*; if so, the reference to *triumphi* cited by W.L. Schreiber from the statutes of Bergamo, Brescia, Salo and Reggio nell'Emilia may not have been to Tarot games. On balance, this does not seem to me very likely; but without doubt the 1482 reference generates perplexity. An examination of the document at the Archives Nationales might yield further clues.

How close a relative? The World card in the Castello Sforzesco set suggests that, as on the Cary sheet, the trump cards were without (visible) numerals, just as were those of the Tarocco Bolognese at that date; but the conclusion is uncertain, since there could have been numerals on all the trumps except the highest, as in the Metropolitan Museum pack. In any case, it is a presumption, though not a certainty, that the trump order was as given by Susio rather than as in the Tarot de Marseille. Indeed, were it not for the Cary sheet, we might suspect Viévil's pack, rather than the Tarot de Marseille, to preserve the Milanese tradition of design; for it will be recalled that Viévil's World resembles that of the Tarot de Marseille, and hence also the Castello Sforzesco card, much more closely than it does that of de Hautot or of the Belgian Tarot. The few pre-eighteenth-century court cards from the Castello Sforzesco show that the Milanese designs of the time were far from wholly identical with those of the Tarot de Marseille. The French cardmakers introduced Batons of Spanish type for the Cavalier and Jack of that suit, and a straight-sided Cup of Spanish type for the Jack of Cups. Probably they departed in many other respects as well from the Milanese prototypes, and the same may easily be true for the trump cards. But, at the same time, the wide-brimmed hats found in two of the court cards of the classical deities set corroborate our general conclusion that the Tarot de Marseille was of Milanese origin.

We have, then, a surprising result: the Tarot pack entered France with a pattern of design ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille but with a trump order almost identical with that of Viévil's pack. Viévil's trump order was thus not, in the first place at least, especially associated with the Paris/Rouen standard pattern. Rather, it must have been a survival from an earlier epoch: perhaps the modified order which is found in Geoffroy's pack of 1557, in the anonymous Parisian pack and in the Tarot de Marseille existed alongside the original Milanese one for a considerable time. What, then, can have been the origin of the Paris/Rouen pattern which finished its career as the Tarot pattern proper to Belgium? It has certain particular affinities with Italian Tarot cards. The man with the compasses found on the Star appears on the Moon card in the Minchiate pack and the Tarocco Bolognese, and also in the hand-painted 'Charles VI' set (no. 4 in Chapter 4); and the woman with the distaff on the Moon card appears in the Tarocco Bolognese and the 'Charles VI' set on the Sun. There is also a resemblance between the World in de Hautot's pack and in the Belgian Tarot and the World in both the Minchiate pack and the Tarocco Bolognese, and also in the 'Charles VI' set and the Catania set (no. 7 in Chapter 4). We cannot be sure how significant this last point of affinity may be, since the Rouen and Belgian World seems to have been copied from the anonymous Parisian pack, Viévil's version being quite different. It is unlikely that any French or Belgian cardmaker would know anything about Florentine, Bolognese or Ferrarese cards. The likeliest hypothesis seems to be as follows. It has been argued that a Tarot pack with a type A order for the trumps, such as prevailed in Bologna and Florence, must, before the eighteenth century, have been in use in Piedmont. The game presumably spread there from somewhere like Bologna, Florence or Rome, just as the game of Minchiate had by the seventeenth century spread from Florence to Genoa. The designs for this former Piedmontese pack may, then, have become the original of the Paris/Rouen pattern; they could easily have passed via Savoy into France, existing French tradition being too strong to allow this type of Tarot pack to retain its type A trump order. (Possibly the employment of a shortened 62-card pack at Chambéry points to Bologna as the most likely place of origin.) On this hypothesis, therefore, the ancestor of the Belgian Tarot was this lost Piedmontese pattern. A small piece of evidence in its favour is the preservation in Savoy into the 1900s of the form *Baga* employed by Viévil to name the trump I.

The Playing-Card Society is engaged upon a definitive classification of all standard patterns that can be indubitably recognised as such, and for this purpose assigns numbers to each pattern: thus the Tarot de Marseille is IT-1, the Tarocco Bolognese IT-2 and the Belgian Tarot IT-3, the letter I indicating an Italian-suited pattern and the letter T a Tarot pack.[26] Numbers with more than one digit indicate derivatives from the pattern whose number is found by deleting the last digit: thus the Tarot de Besançon, regarded as a modification of the Tarot de Marseille, is IT-1·4, and the romanticised nineteenth-century version, still used in Switzerland, that is its only modern descendant is IT-1·41. The Tarot de Marseille has lasted down to the present day, though now mostly used for fortune-telling. The Tarot de Besançon, which was used, though not of course exclusively, almost everywhere in Europe except Belgium and Italy, died out, save for the IT-1·41 form, in the nineteenth century.[27] Of the Italian derivatives from the Tarot de Marseille, the earliest form of the Tarocco Piemontese receives the number IT-1·2. It was subsequently modified, making it less precisely similar to the Tarot de Marseille, and replacing the French inscriptions by Italian ones; this second stage is labelled IT-1·21. A further modification resulted in the double-headed version of the Tarocco Piemontese used today, labelled IT-1·211. The Lombard pattern, whether with French or Italian inscriptions, is designated IT-1·1. In the early nineteenth century it was replaced by a romanticised version, sufficiently different to merit a distinct numeral after the decimal point, and thus designated IT-1·3, subsequently succeeded by a slightly modified double-headed version, IT-1·31. The IT-1·31 tradition, sometimes inaccurately called the Tarocchino Milanese, in its turn died out, leaving the modern Tarocco Piemontese, IT-2·11, as the sole form of 78-card pack now used in Italy. (The term *tarocchino* has been applied to IT-1·3 because of the small size of the cards; properly it should relate only to a reduced number of cards in the pack.)

What, then, of the subsequent history of our conjectural four early Italian standard patterns? The Bolognese one presents no problems. We know the stages through which it went: the replacement of the old design for the Devil by a new one, say around 1600; the substitution of the Moors for the *Papi* in 1725; the introduction of numerals on the trumps and the change to a double-headed form in the later eighteenth century. The Metropolitan Museum pattern, which we have taken to characterise Venice and perhaps Ferrara, has a single possible surviving later exemplar, the isolated Love card in the Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Poplari in Rome (no. 28 above). The design is more complex than that of the corresponding card on the Metropolitan Museum sheet, of which only the top half remains. The latter shows only a Cupid in the air aiming his bow, with a man below on the left and a girl on the right. The later card has an additional *putto* in the air, and, below, an embracing couple on the left and, in front of them, two musicians, one in a feathered hat playing a viol da gamba and the other playing a lute. This could, however, be seen as a development of the earlier design: what makes it probable that it represents a descendant of the same pattern, or comes at least from a pack with a type B order, is its being numbered VIII, like the Metropolitan Museum card (as it would presumably also have been numbered in the Rouen pack and in any with the Garzoni/Bertoni version of the type B order). The Museo Nazionale card is cited by the anonymous editors of *Antiche Carte de Tarocchi* as Venetian, of the late sixteenth century; it may be as late as the seventeenth century. By Garzoni's testimony, the type B order was still known in the 1580s. It seems likely, however, that the game of Tarot suffered a general loss of popularity, in Venice and Ferrara, during the sixteenth century. The verse diatribe by Lollio, a Ferrarese author whose poem was published in a collection printed in Venice, was obviously less than half serious, like Berni's earlier derisory remarks; but it evidently indicates a decline in the esteem with which the game was regarded in the mid-sixteenth century. Probably we shall not be far wrong if we see the Venice/Ferrara pattern, and, with it, the type B order, as having died out not

[26] The Society issues a four-page sheet for each standard pattern, illustrating characteristic cards, giving its history and listing prominent makers past and present.

[27] The Playing-Card Society sheet on IT-1·4 says that, although 'it was not until about 1800 that any quantity of these cards were made in Besançon, ... the pattern can barely have survived the early part of the 19th century, being replaced in most areas by the French-suited Tarot packs'. This latter remark is certainly true of Germany and the Austrian Empire; but, as reported in Chapter 15, a booklet on the game first published in Besançon in 1880 still describes it as played with an Italian-suited pack; so the Tarot de Besançon probably survived in Besançon itself until the end of the century or later.

long after 1600.

From the set no. (29) of *tarocchi* found at the Castello Sforzesco, it seems likely that the Milanese pattern, of which the Cary sheet is the earliest example, survived into the seventeenth century, although the dating of that set is far from certain. The reintroduction in about 1740 of the 78-card pack in its IT-1·1 form represented a revival of an ancient tradition; but it is difficult to guess how long the interval had been during which Tarocco had no longer been played. As for the ancient Piedmontese pattern whose existence, as the ancestor of the Paris/Rouen pattern, we have conjectured, that can hardly have died out much more than thirty years before the introduction of IT-1·2, if there were to be players who still remembered that the *Angelo* used to be superior to the *Mondo*.

The Florentine pattern represented by the Rosenwald sheets had, by contrast, a very eventful history. At some time before the invention of the Minchiate pack in the first half of the sixteenth century, the pattern must have assumed a partly Portuguese type of suit-system, by changing the shape of the Swords from curved to straight. It is, presumably, this type of 78-card pack that is represented in seventeenth-century Florence by the Orfeo packs. Save for the Marchese di Villabianca, there is no known literary reference alluding to any type of Tarot game other than Minchiate played in Florence or in Rome during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet the Orfeo and alla Colonna packs testify to the continued existence in both cities of the 78-card pack. On Villabianca's testimony, the 78-card pack was introduced into Sicily by the Viceroy in 1663. Since the Minchiate pack was, according to him, introduced at the same time, it must have been in Florence or in Rome that the Viceroy had become acquainted with these games, and he is much more likely to have visited Rome than Florence. This is confirmed by the fact that the 78-card pack introduced into Sicily must have had a type A order, and, moreover, as we have seen, probably had 'Portuguese' suit-signs. From the alla Colonna pack, it is apparent that in Rome the Florentine type of Tarot pack had evolved into one using a fully-fledged 'Portuguese' suit-system; and it must have been a pack of this kind which was ancestral to the Tarocco Siciliano. We know, in broad outline, the later history of the Tarot pack in Sicily. The Minchiate pack died out in Sicily during the eighteenth century, but continued to flourish in Florence until almost the end of the nineteenth, and, in Genoa, until the 1930s. As for the Portuguese or Italo-Portuguese versions of the 78-card pack, descended from the Florentine pattern, and used in Rome and Florence, we must suppose them to have become obsolete some time in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Though we have been forced to rely on a good deal of conjecture, we have been able with its help to reconstruct in outline the entire history of the Latin-suited Tarot pack, which can be illustrated by a diagram. For this diagram, the Playing-Card Society numbers for standard patterns have been supplemented by some additional ones. A zero after the decimal point may be used to indicate an ancestor of a single-digit pattern: thus the postulated Milanese pattern represented by the Cary sheet, ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille, is designated IT-1·0. The original and the later Minchiate patterns are designated IPT-1 and IPT-1·1 respectively in the P.-C.S. system, the letters IP, which refer to the suit-system, standing for 'Italo-Portuguese', while IPT-2 is used for the early version of the Tarocco Siciliano, IPT-2·1 representing the later form (from the Fortuna pack down to Modiano). It seems better to alter these numbers so as to be able to indicate the relationship with patterns for 78-card packs. Thus the Orfeo packs may be designated IPT-5, the Florentine pattern represented by the Rosenwald sheets IT-5·0, and the Minchiate patterns redesignated IPM-5 and IPM-5·1. It seems better to indicate a fully-fledged Portuguese pattern by the single letter P: if the two stages of the Tarocco Siciliano are then redesignated PT-6 and PT-6·1, we can use PT-6·0 for the alla Colonna pattern. The Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets agree with later Tarocco Bolognese designs closely enough to justify the use for them of the straight designation IT-2, while the Venetian pattern represented by the Metropolitan Museum sheets can be called IT-4. The pack made by de Hautot in Rouen obviously exemplifies just the same pattern as the later Belgian Tarot, IT-3 in the P.-C.S. numbering; although Viévil's pack has many differences, in particular having a different trump order and including the Pope and Popess, we may use the same number for it, keeping IT-3·0 for the conjectural Piedmontese ancestor of this pattern. We thus arrive at the following code, where an asterisk denotes a number not used by the P.-C.S.:

IT-1·0• : Milanese pattern (Cary sheet and Castello Sforzesco set)
IT-1 : Tarot de Marseille
IT-1·1 : Lombard version of the Tarot de Marseille
IT-1·2 Tarocco Piemontese (early form)
IT-1·21 : Tarocco Piemontese (intermediate form)
IT-1·211: Tarocco Piemontese (modern double-headed form)
IT-1·3 : romanticised Milanese version of IT-1·1
IT-1·31 : double-headed version of IT-1·3
IT-1·4 : Tarot de Besançon
IT-1·41 : romanticised Swiss version of IT-1·4
IT-2 : Tarocco Bolognese
IT-3·0• : conjectural early Piedmontese pattern
IT-3 : Paris/Rouen pattern and Belgian Tarot
IT-4• : Venetian/Ferrarese pattern (Metropolitan Museum sheets)
IT-5·0• : early Florentine pattern (Rosenwald sheets)
IPT-5• : later Florentine pattern (Orfeo packs)
IPM-5• : original Minchiate pattern (P.-C.S. number IPT-1)
IPM-5·1• later Minchiate pattern (P.-C.S. number IPT-1·1)
PT-6·0•: Roman pattern (alla Colonna sheets)
PT-6• : Tarocco Siciliano, early form (P.-C. S. number IPT-2)
PT-6·1•: Tarocco Siciliano, later form (P.-C. S. number IPT-2·1)

The diagram is principally concerned to show where the different patterns were *used*, rather than where they were made; thus, although Bologna cardmakers produced both Minchiate cards and Lombard pattern packs, neither is shown under Bologna because neither was used there. A solid line indicates that cards of the given type and made in or for the given area survive to us from the given period; a short line indicates a single surviving set, a longer one the existence of packs sufficiently close in date to warrant a presumption of continuous manufacture and employment. In some cases, of course, the dates are only approximate. A dotted line indicates the conjectural use of the given type of Tarot pack; the grounds for such conjectures vary in strength, and have been set out in this chapter. Where a given pattern has travelled from one area to another, this is indicated by a nearly horizontal line with an arrow; where one pattern has developed out of an earlier one which then continued to co-exist with it, this has been shown by a nearly horizontal line without an arrow, whether the new pattern was used in the same area or another; where a pattern was replaced by a new one that had developed from it, this is shown by a small horizontal bar across the vertical line. French-suited Tarot patterns are not shown. The part of the diagram from 1700 on is not open to doubt; that before 1700 is highly conjectural. Further research may yield a different picture. The diagram will be found on the end-papers.

It may be asked which of the trump orders was the original one, that which was intended when the Tarot pack was first devised. If we knew nothing about the geographical associations of the different orders, it would be natural to guess that a type A order was the original one, for several reasons. First, it seems more intelligible that the Angel, which undoubtedly represents the Last Judgment, should be placed at the end of the sequence than in the penultimate or antepenultimate position. Secondly, save for the association of Justice with the Judgment, it seems difficult to discern any appropriateness in the scattering of the Virtues through the sequence in orders of types B and C. And thirdly, if a type A order were the original one, it would be possible to explain the invention of types B and C as devices for bringing the Death card to position 13 once the practice of numbering the trump cards had been introduced. The evidence of geographical association shows this guess unlikely to be right. Of the two possible claimants for the birthplace of the Tarot pack, Ferrara certainly observed a type B order and Milan very probably a type C order; furthermore, we saw that it is likely that, in Italy, the trumps in packs with a type C order were not numbered, so that we cannot explain the genesis of this order in the way suggested. In the present state of knowledge, the question concerning the priority of the three types of order does not seem to be a fruitful one. What the variations do strongly suggest is that there was never any very great symbolic significance in the precise order in which the trump subjects were arranged. It will be recalled that the Visconti di Modrone pack, the earliest that has survived to us, differed from all later ones in having six court cards, and thus sixteen cards altogether, in each suit, and also in containing Faith, Hope and Charity, as well as Fortitude, among its trump cards, and therefore, probably, all seven Virtues. It was suggested in Chapter 4 that it may have had as many as twenty-four trumps, the constant factor being the 3:2 ratio of trumps to cards per suit. There is, of course, no way of being sure of its exact composition. It is possible that the Visconti di Modrone pack was no more than a freak, and that what was later the standard composition of the Tarot pack was standard from the time of its first invention. But it is also possible that the Visconti di Modrone pack represents the original form of the Tarot pack, and that the 78-card pack as we know it is the result of a modification adopted early in its history. If so, the standard set of twenty-one trumps must itself be the slightly mutilated remnant of the original, and possibly larger, set. In that case, we could not expect any ordering of the trumps in the standard set to make perfect sense; even if there was any particular symbolic intention underlying the original sequence of Tarot trumps, which there may not have been, we could expect fully to understand it only if we knew which subjects the original set contained and in what order they were arranged. It is unlikely that we ever shall.

This chapter has attempted a reconstruction, no doubt to be improved as further evidence is uncovered, of the history of the Latin-suited Tarot pack. Despite two centuries of research on playing cards, it was only very recently that this history began to be investigated. Until then, writers on playing cards were content to rely on a standard traditional account, amounting only to a static classification into types (Tarocchino, Minchiate, etc.), as if these had all come into existence on the eighth day of creation; among such types, the so-called Venetian Tarocchi formed a mere ragbag comprising all 78-card Italian Tarot packs. The reason for this failure has been the lack of any clear concept of standard patterns: without this theoretical tool, a historian cannot set aside luxury packs and other obviously non-standard ones, and hence can make only the crudest distinctions within the heterogeneity of the data that then confront him. As in other areas of the subject, such as Portuguese-suited cards, the first steps towards an analysis of the evolution of Latin-suited Tarot cards were taken by Sylvia Mann. As explained in the introduction, I have refrained from cluttering up the preceding exposition with repeated acknowledgments to her. Her contribution has, however, been so substantial that it requires more than a generalised recognition. This is particularly so for two reasons: academics working in the field are prone to underestimate the contributions of a non-academic; and the magnitude of her contribution cannot be estimated from her published writings. Probably the most enduring monument to her work will be the Playing-Card Society's anonymous classificatory sheets, mentioned above, a project inspired, and in considerable part executed, by her. A great many of her ideas, freely offered, have been incorporated into the work of others and first expressed in print in their writings; of that process, this book contains many examples. I have been happy to be able to work in this field as a member of the school of which she is the leader.

A number of observations by her formed the basis for my own work on the subject. She first drew attention to the importance of the Orfeo packs, which had escaped the attention of everyone else, and proposed that, rather than very incomplete Minchiate packs, they were nearly complete 78-card ones. She also identified the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets as from what she, probably mistakenly, described as a 'Tarocchino' pack, but at any rate from Bologna. She emphasised the problem posed by the Belgian Tarot, and remarked on the affinity between certain of its cards and some of the Italian ones. She also noticed that the Tarot de Marseille was restricted to French-speaking regions, and that the Tarot de Besançon was originally used in German-speaking ones.

All these observations are, in my opinion, sound and illuminating. But the most important thesis advanced by her, concerning the Italian Tarot de Marseille-derived packs, proved more problematic. She was the first to distinguish between the two standard patterns, that ancestral to the Tarocco Piemontese (IT-1·2), restricted to Piedmont, and that with narrow cards and fold-over backs (IT1·1), made in many parts of Italy. (The ground for describing the latter as 'the Lombard pattern' rests on information from literary sources concerning where it was used, evidence which, whenever possible, ought to supplement that based on place of manufacture.) She remarked that these patterns appear to have been introduced only in the eighteenth century, and proposed that this was to be explained on the hypothesis that the 78-card pack, and the game played with it, had died out in Italy during the seventeenth century, and had been reintroduced from France.

Principally because of the French inscriptions originally used on these two patterns, I continue to view this thesis as essentially correct. Nevertheless, as first propounded, it was misleading in two respects. First, it rested on the idea that there was something describable as 'the Italian 78-card pack', and something describable as 'the Italian game with 78 cards'. In fact, there has been much more interplay between the designs of Tarot cards and the modes of play with the 78-card pack between countries other than Italy than there has ever been within Italy. The distinct traditions of design and of play evidently established before the close of the fifteenth century appear thereafter to have remained without influence on one another, and to have evolved, in so far as they did evolve, quite independently. What first made this clear was the investigation into the different trump orders. The various orders could have been established only at a date at which there were as yet no numerals on the trump cards; and, in each of the different centres, the order there observed could have been fixed only at the moment of the first introduction of the Tarot pack, since, once a trump order had been agreed on, utter confusion would have resulted among players if it were to be changed, at least so long as each trump card was identified primarily by its subject rather than by an inscribed numeral. But, even if Miss Mann's thesis, as originally stated, incorporated an error in this regard, it was she herself who prompted its correction; for, although it was I who carried out the investigation into the trump orders, it was she who saw the importance this might have and first suggested to me that I look into it.

Secondly, the thesis suggested, what I at first assumed, that no designs resembling the Tarot de Marseille were known in Italy before the eighteenth century; from this it appeared to follow that the Tarot de Marseille was a purely French invention. As explained above, this is not so at all: the Cary sheet and the Castello Sforzesco cards show that very similar designs were in use in Milan from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. It therefore appears that the Tarot de Marseille was derived from a Milanese prototype; and this conclusion weakens, though it does not destroy, the case for assuming that the introduction of the Lombard pattern occurred only after an interval during which the 78-card pack had been defunct. Moreover, the natural presumption is that the form of Tarot game played outside Italy with the 78-card pack was descended from the Milanese game. On this assumption, it ceases to be of such importance whether or not there was an interval before the adoption of the Lombard pattern: the game played after the interval would still have been, in broad outline, similar to that played before it.

In the end, therefore, it appears that Sylvia Mann's thesis rests on a slenderer base of evidence, and has less far-reaching consequences, than at first appeared. That is not to disparage the importance of the step taken by her in advancing it. For one thing, it served as a surrogate for the realisation of the independence of the four Italian traditions of Tarot play, by making what is probably to be regarded as the Milanese tradition appear as an eighteenth-century importation from abroad. For another, it was a first attempt to make sense of the very confusing evidence, which those who spoke about 'the Venetian Tarot' as a single type alongside the Tarocchino and Minchiate packs had simply declined even to try to interpret. At the present stage, the history of Tarot cards in Lombardy before the eighteenth century stands in need of further investigation. We cannot be sure that there was indeed an interval during which they were no longer used. We cannot be sure that the trump order used in the Tarot de Marseille was really a French invention, and that, before the eighteenth century, players in Lombardy remained faithful to the Susio/Viévil order. In both cases I have suggested affirmative answers; but more evidence is desirable. We do not know just how the indigenous Milanese trump designs evolved, or how close they came to be to those of the Tarot de Marseille; nor do we know whether, before 1700, Milanese players continued to use trumps without inscribed numerals. As for Piedmont, the uncertainty concerning it is greater still. We have sufficient reason to assume that the game was known there before the eighteenth century, and that there was indeed some break in continuity; but it is conceivable that this break occurred earlier, and was ended by the introduction of Milanese designs, some time before the latter were in turn replaced by the earliest form of the Tarocco Piemontese. Until these problems, and those relating to the exact evolution of the 78-card pack in Florence, Rome and Sicily, have been resolved, there can be no assurance that we have successfully reconstructed the history of Latin-suited Tarot cards. But the first progress towards such a reconstruction was made by Sylvia Mann, and it would have been improper to have ended this chapter without making clear that this was so.

Note on classical deities set

As stated on p. 409, there are now nineteen cards, of those found at the Castello Sforzesco with back designs of classical deities, in the Raccolta delle Stampe Achille Bertarelli. Novati, in his article in the *Bullettino dei civici musei*, gives the number found of this type as twenty-one; there is some discrepancy between the numbers cited by him of cards with particular back designs and those at present in the Raccolta. In detail, the numbers are as follows (the figures in brackets being those given by Novati): Iove – 4(7); Mercurio – 1(1); Proserpina – 4(2); Ercule – 1(3); Marte – 2(0); Pluto – 2(0); Venere – 1(1); Veritas – 3(3); Saturno – 1(1); Diana – 0(2); unidentified – 0(1). It will be seen that the discrepancies are not all in the same direction, which makes them very puzzling.

CHAPTER 21

The Early Italian Game

We can construct a detailed history of Tarot games, in almost all countries, from the mid-eighteenth century to the present day, with no more than the unavoidable minimum of lacunas. Of the first three hundred years of their history, on the other hand, we have only the patchiest evidence. From the seventeenth century we have only two explicit accounts of Tarot games of any kind: the description of French and Swiss Tarot in the 1659 *Maison académique*, and Paolo Minucci's account of Minchiate in 1676; to these we may add the citations in Carlo Pisarri's *Instruzioni* of 1754 from his 'very old' manuscript relating to Tarocchino. For the rest, we must rely on indirect evidence and backwards extrapolation.

The diversity of orderings of the trumps which we have seen to prevail in different regions of Italy points to an early diversification in the manner of play. Variations in the local design of cards using the same suit-signs are not always closely associated with variations in the games played; but a difference in the order of the trumps affects the actual practice of play. It is therefore likely in principle that, where different trump orderings were observed, there were also concomitant variations in the rules of play. The variations in the trump order must have developed at an early date, before it had occurred to anyone to put numerals on the trumps. Since there are such numerals on all but one of the trumps on the Metropolitan Museum sheets, and on more than half of those on the Rosenwald sheet, this means that the differentiation in the type of Tarot game played in the various regions probably occurred well before the end of the fifteenth century.

We should beware of distorting the manner in which Italian players perceived Tarot cards and the games played with them by the use of such expressions as 'the game of Tarot' and 'the Tarot pack'. Outside Italy, even when Tarot has been extremely popular, the Tarot pack has, naturally, always been seen as something quite special and exceptional. Until the Italian suit-signs were replaced by the French ones, even the suit-system was quite unfamiliar, except to those who knew that other oddity, the Trappola pack. But in Italy, at least during the sixteenth century, when Tarot cards had existed far too long to be a novelty, but Tarot games were still sufficiently popular and widespread for the cards not to appear a mere local peculiarity, they do not seem to have been regarded as forming a special pack. Rather, the Tarot trumps were simply special cards which you needed to add to the ordinary ones in order to play certain games. Originally called *triumphi*, a set of cards including them were *carte da triumphi*, cards with trumps. Thus, in the passage of his *Caos del Triperuno* leading up to the five sonnets on the Tarot trumps, Teofilo Folengo has Triperuno speak of being led to a room where there were *carte lusorie de trionfi*, 'playing cards with trumps'; and Sperone Speroni, in his brief tract on games, says that to the cards of the four suits one sometimes adds certain other cards called *tarocchi*, so that the first distinction to be made concerning the cards used is whether they are with *tarocchi* or without *tarocchi*. Something viewed as being a special kind of pack, quite different from ordinary playing cards, for instance the Aluette pack, the Trappola pack or the Tarot pack itself outside Italy, is likely to be treated as an instrument of just one game, even if one played with a number of variations in its rules. But, where the Tarot trumps are regarded, not as a part of any such special pack, but merely as cards which, for some games, are added to the ordinary pack, one would no more expect them to be used in just one game than one would expect ordinary playing cards to be used for only one game. This expectation is corroborated by the remark made by Pier Antonio Viti at the end of his commentary on the special Tarot pack devised by the poet Matteo Maria Boiardo: with these cards, he says, many other games can be played, just as many as is continually done with the ordinary (Tarot) pack.[1] The point should not be overstated: Francesco Berni and others refer to Tarocchi as a specific game. Nevertheless, it would almost certainly be wrong to suppose that there was just one such game known in each region of sixteenth-century Italy where Tarot games were played. The Tarot trumps were introduced in order to fulfil a novel function in card play, and were used in games in which they fulfilled that function; but there was probably a considerable variety of such games.

We know of four main centres where Tarot games were played in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy: Ferrara, Milan, Bologna and Florence. It was also played in Reggio nell' Emilia, Salò, Brescia, Bergamo and Urbino, and very probably at Mantua and Venice. By the beginning of the seventeenth century it had spread to Rome, and, in the course of that century, it spread to Sicily and presumably to Piedmont. Of the mode of play in Bologna we can feel fairly certain. We know that the game was, in all its essential features, played there in the seventeenth century in the same manner as it is played now. The extreme conservatism of Bolognese players, and the great complexity of the seventeenth-century game, in which various additional features that have since fallen away were superimposed on the basic rules, make it very likely that those basic rules go back to the first half of the sixteenth century, when the shortening of the pack probably first occurred; and they may well date back to the time before the pack had been shortened. Minchiate, too, we know to have been played in the seventeenth century in essentially the same manner as it was played in the eighteenth; it is highly probable that the fundamental principles of the game were established when it was first devised.

Of the Milanese manner of play, we have no direct evidence whatever. Since, however, we have concluded that it was from Milan that the game of Tarot first spread to France and Switzerland, from those countries to reach Germany and other parts of Europe, we have to regard Milan as the ultimate source of all the Tarot games played outside Italy, as well as those played in present-day Piedmont and Lombardy. This means that the original Milanese games were probably very close to what, at the beginning of Chapter 11, were described as being the fundamental three- and four-handed forms of Tarot game, ones in which all the cards are dealt out, save for three or two additional ones taken by the dealer, and in which the counting cards are the court cards and the XXI, Bagatto and Fool, the Fool serving as Excuse. The very existence of the early Piedmontese game rests only on a hypothesis, and our principal evidence to its nature consists of the later Piedmontese games of Sedici and Trentuno, which look like a survival from before the introduction of games after the French fashion in the eighteenth century. These have two striking characteristics, namely that the Fool does not serve as Excuse, but is the lowest trump, and that not all the cards are dealt out and there is no discard. The French games described in the *Maison académique* have the second of these characteristics, though not the first, unlike the Swiss game described there, which lacks both. Since we have conjectured that the French games were played in those areas, Paris and Normandy, where the Paris/Rouen pattern was used, and that, in the East of France, Tarot play was more akin to that described as prevalent in Switzerland, and since we have also conjectured that the Paris/Rouen pattern derived from Piedmont, this affords a partial confirmation of the idea that Sedici and Trentuno represent some earlier form of Piedmontese Tarot play. As for the other cities mentioned above, probably the mode of play in each of them conformed to that of one of the four main centres; if any of them was a centre for some other tradition of Tarot play, it is now irrecoverable.

Minchiate was, of course, a deliberate invention, a conscious variation upon existing Tarocco games; but we know that in both Florence and Rome the 78-card pack continued to be in use down to the seventeenth century. Our best clue to the nature of such games consists in those played in Sicily; the Sicilian game was probably first imported from Rome, and the traditions of Tarot play in Rome seem to have been strongly linked with those of Florence. If this hypothesis is sound, then what Minchiate shared with the game played in Florence and Rome with the 78-card pack was not the *versicole* but the fact that, in addition to the Bagatto and the Fool, all five top trumps, the *arie*, were counting cards; the *versicole*, special combinations of cards for which one scored not only when they were contained in a single hand at the start of play, but also when they were included in the cards won by partners at the end of play, formed a point of resemblance with Tarocchino as played in Bologna.

---

[1] 'Cum li quali molti altri se fariano, e tanti, quanti con il commune di continuo se fa.'

What emerges as the principal point of distinction between the different local traditions of play is the number of counting cards. In all games other than Minchiate, the court cards are always counting cards. In Milan there can have been only three others, the XXI, Bagatto and Fool, as in every Tarot game played outside Italy. In the Bolognese form of Tarocchi, there are four, the two top trumps, *Angelo* and *Mondo*, the Bagatto and the Fool. In Sicilian Tarocchi, and therefore, on our hypothesis, in the 78-card game as formerly played in Florence and Rome, there are seven, the five top trumps, the Bagatto and the Fool; and in Minchiate there are twenty-one, the eleven top trumps, the five lowest ones, four others and the Fool. On the other hand, both in Sicilian Tarocchi and in Minchiate, though not in Tarocchino, there are signs that the three usual counting cards have a special role. In Sicilian Tarocchi this lies in the fact that these cards have a point-value twice that of a King or of one of the other four *arie*; in Minchiate, it consists in the existence of a *versicola* consisting of the *Trombe, Uno* and *Matto*, corresponding to the Angel, Bagatto and Fool. Tarocchino, Minchiate and Sicilian Tarocchi also all have a feature presumably absent from the Milanese game, since scarcely a trace of it is found in any Tarot game played outside Italy: a fixed score in points for winning the last trick. This is, indeed, a well-known feature of many card games played with a regular pack; it is found, in particular, in the Venetian game of Trappola. On the other hand, no Italian Tarot game which we know to have been uninfluenced by foreign modes of play has a vestige of that idea which became so characteristic an element of Tarot games as played elsewhere, the special bonus for winning the last trick with the Bagatto. In Tarocchino and in Sicilian Tarocchi, and presumably also in the early Milanese game, the whole pack is distributed; even in Minchiate, there is a device for ensuring that all the counting cards are in play and that the players know how many trumps are not in play. Virtually the only varieties of Tarot that form exceptions to this general rule are some of the minor Bolognese games, the Piedmontese games of Sedici and Trentuno and their hypothetical predecessors, and the French games described in the *Maison académique*.

We have, thus, some idea of the type of Tarot game played in early times in Bologna, in Florence and in Milan. We cannot in the same way use the method of backwards extrapolation to deduce the kind of game played in Ferrara, and probably also in Venice and other cities where the type B order prevailed, because this game appears to have died leaving no progeny behind. Our only, uncertain, clue of this kind is the Venetian game of Trappola, which may have been invented by card players familiar with Tarocco. The only direct evidence we have consists of two literary items, of which, unfortunately, neither proves as illuminating as we should wish. The first is the commentary by Pier Antonio Viti already mentioned. Matteo Maria Boiardo (1441-1494) was the celebrated author of the verse epic *Orlando Innamorato* which preceded the even more famous *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto. Boiardo composed two sonnets and five *capitoli* which were first published posthumously in 1523,[2] and have subsequently become known as *I Tarocchi*, though not so entitled by Boiardo. They were included in a selection of Boiardo's work edited by G.B. Venturi in 1820, and were accompanied, in Angelo Solerti's collected edition of Boiardo's poetry of 1894, by an *Illustrazione* or Commentary by Pier Antonio Viti da Urbino (*c.* 1470-1500) not previously published and taken by Solerti from a manuscript.[3] Viti's commentary is addressed to a lady of the court of Urbino, though not to the Duchess Elisabetta herself; Ridolfo Renier suggested as the recipient Emilia Pia, a close friend of the Duchess.[4] Viti explains that the poems are intended to be engraved on the cards of a specially designed pack, and expresses the hope that his patroness will order such a pack to be made. There are to be eighty cards altogether, two of which are to bear nothing but the two sonnets: the remainder are to comprise four suits, twenty-one *trionfi* and the *Macto* (i.e. *Matto*). The composition of the pack, apart from the two sonnet cards, was thus to be standard for a 78-card Tarot pack; but the suit-signs and the trump subjects were to be non-standard. The suits were to be Arrows, Vases, Eyes and Whips; each of the *trionfi* was to symbolise a quality, represented by a historical or mythological character. The trump subjects for the most part show no correspondence with those of the standard set, and, when they do, occupy a different position; for instance, the highest trump was *Fortezza* (Fortitude), represented by Lucretia; in a reversal of the usual arrangement, the *Macto*, called *Folle* by Boiardo himself, was designated *Mondo* (World), and shown as a fool riding a donkey. The figures on the court cards were to be identified with characters from classical mythology. Each of the seventy-eight cards was to bear a tercet from the appropriate *capitolo*: those of the Arrows suit from the *capitolo* on Love, of the Vases suit from that on Hope, of the Eyes suit from that on Jealousy, and of the Whips suits from that on Fear; the *tercets* for the *trionfi* and the *Macto* were to be taken from the fifth *capitolo*, the Triumph of the World. Wood-engraved packs were actually made to Viti's precise specifications. One example, missing the Matto, the trumps and twelve other cards is mentioned by Merlin in his book of 1869;[5] what was probably the same copy was sold in London in 1971 to Signor Carlo Alberto Chiesa of Milan. Another example, missing the Matto and the court cards, but including the trumps, was mentioned by Carlo Lozzi in 1900.[6]

---

[2] In a volume containing poems by various authors and entitled *Amore di Hieronimo Beniueni Fiorentino, Allo Illustris. S. Nicolo da Correggio. Et una Caccia de Amore bellissima & cinq: Capituli, sopra el Timore, Zelosia, Speranza, Amore, & uno Trionpho del Mondo, Composti per il Conte Matteo Maria Boiardo et altre cose diverse* (Venice, 1523). The volume was reprinted five more times in the years up to 1537 and again in 1808.

Viti gives some instructions for playing with Boiardo's pack. Although Viti himself was from Urbino, and although his commentary is addressed to a lady at the court of Urbino, it is not unreasonable to connect this piece of evidence with Ferrara, at least if Viti be assumed to be setting out the intentions of Boiardo himself. Boiardo was brought up in Ferrara and studied there; he spent some time at court, and was highly esteemed by Borso d'Este, Marquis of Ferrara from 1450. Borso was made Duke of Modena and Reggio by the Emperor Frederick III in 1452, and Duke of Ferrara by Pope Paul II in 1471, the year of his death. Boiardo was in the service of his successor, Ercole I, the father of Isabella and Beatrice, acting as ducal captain of Modena from 1480 to 1482 and as governor of Reggio from 1487 until his death there in 1494. It must, therefore, have been the Ferrarese type of Tarocco game with which he was familiar; it is possible that they played in the same manner at Urbino. Viti's instructions, though interesting, are of far less value for us than we might have hoped, because, as is plain from the remark quoted above, Viti takes it for granted that his reader will know all about the games normally played with the ordinary Tarot pack, and restricts himself to an account of a special game to be played with Boiardo's cards. This game falls into four parts. The two cards bearing the sonnets are first set aside, and then each draws a card to determine the dealer, who is the one drawing the highest card. When the cards have all been dealt out, the first part of the game consists simply in each player's reading out the verses on his cards, from which, Viti naively remarks, much amusement may be had. It is not expained what happens when the number of players is such that the cards cannot be distributed equally and exhaustively. The second part of the game consists in playing out the cards in tricks: it is necessary to follow suit when possible, and, when not possible, to play a trump. Nothing is said about the way the Matto is played. Among the numeral cards, the higher-numbered beat the lower-numbered in the suits of Arrows and Vases, but, in those of Eyes and Whips, the lower-numbered beat the higher-numbered; among the trumps, the higher-numbered win. At the end of the play, each player is paid by every other player who has won fewer tricks than he has as many *scuti* as the difference in the number of tricks they have won. At this stage, those who have won no tricks fall out of the game, the third part of which now takes place. Using the cards they have won in tricks, each player reckons up points as follows: he counts one positive point for each card he has in the suits of Arrows and Vases, and one negative point for each card in the suits of Eyes and Whips; presumably trumps do not count either way. When the points have been thus reckoned, each player may demand from any other who has a lower score that he hand over to him any card of the demander's choice. Presumably it is meant that one card is to be surrendered for each point of difference in the scores, and presumably also, if a player asks for a card which the other does not have, he cannot try again. In choosing which card to ask for, a player will have an eye on the fourth part of the game: this consists in each player's putting together the longest sequence of consecutive cards which he now has in his hand. The winner – the player with the longest such sequence – can demand from the loser (presumably the player with the shortest sequence) everything that he has about his person; clearly, one needs to deposit one's valuables elsewhere before sitting down to play this game.

---

[3] *Le Poesi Volgari e Latine di M.M. Boiardo*, ed. by A. Solerti, Bologna, 1894, pp. 313-38, with notes pp. xxxii-xxxv. Poems and commentary can also be found in *Tutte le opere di M.M. Boiardo*, ed. by A. Zottoli, vol. 2, Milan, 1937, pp. 702-16, with notes pp. 748-9.

[4] See R. Renier, 'Tarocchi di M.M. Boiardo', in *Studi su Matto Maria Boiardo*, ed. by N. Campanini, Bologna, 1894. Elisabetta Gonzaga, Duchess of Urbino, sister of Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, and so sister-in-law of Isabella d'Este, is, like the Lady Emilia Pia, famous from Castiglione's *The Courtier*.

[5] R. Merlin, *Origine des cartes à jouer*, Paris, 1869, pp. 94-6 and plate 28.

[6] Carlo Lozzi, 'Le Antiche Carte da Giuoco', *La Bibliofilia*, vol. I, Florence, 1900, pp. 37-46 and 181-6. For more detailed discussion of this pack, see M. Dummett, 'Notes on a 15th-century pack of cards from Italy', *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. I, no. 3, February, 1973, pp. 1-6.

This somewhat jejune entertainment is hardly a serious card game; it is more consonant with the kind of society game described in various works such as Ringhieri's *Cento Giuochi Liberali*. There is no reason for assuming that any of its special features derive from already existing games played with the ordinary Tarot pack, although we cannot exclude such a possibility; the main value of the account, for our purpose, is in respect of those few fundamental features which it does share with Tarot games as we know them. It is a trick-taking game; the *trionfi* serve as permanent trumps. It is obligatory to follow suit if one can, and to play a trump if one cannot. Not only do all the court cards beat the numeral cards of a suit, but the order of the numeral cards runs in one direction in two suits and in the other direction in the remaining two. Without Viti's commentary, we should have assumed that these were all features of Tarot games from the first; but it is pleasant to have confirmation of that assumption, and, although Viti is not purporting to describe ordinary Tarot games, the fact that his, or Boiardo's, game has these features is some confirmation. On the other hand, there is not a trace of the principle of assigning different point-values to the court cards and to some of the trump cards; the second part of the game is a simple trick-taking game in our technical sense, where only the number of tricks count. This can hardly be called evidence that simple trick-taking games were ever played with the ordinary Tarot pack; but it hints at the possibility.

The most frustrating feature is Viti's silence, in the section on how to play with the cards, over the Matto. Possibly he simply assumed that everyone knew how to use the Matto; but the other possibility is that he intended it to be treated as the lowest trump, as in the eighteenth-century Piedmontese games of Sedici and Trentuno. The allusions to it in Boiardo's verses and in the parts of Viti's commentary relating to the cards are maddeningly ambiguous. In the fifth *capitolo*, which deals with the *trionfi*, the tercet to be inscribed on the Matto stands first, the subject of the card being given as *Mondo*; there follow the tercets on the twenty-one *trionfi* in ascending sequence. From the two lines in the first sonnet relating to the *trionfi*, it is difficult to tell whether Boiardo is counting the Fool as a *trionfo* or not: he writes 'Con vinti et un Trionfo e al piú vil loco/È un *Folle*, poi che'l folle el mondo adora' ('With twenty-one *trionfi*, and in the lowest place there is a Fool, because the fool adores the world'). In Viti's commentary the Matto is not spoken of as a *trionfo* in the paragraph devoted to it, and the next card, *Ozio* (Idleness) is called the first *trionfo*, each of them being given a number up to the last one, Fortitude, said to be in the twenty-first place. At the end of the section on the *trionfi*, Viti speaks of Boiardo's *capitolo* as divided into twenty-two tercets about 'twenty-two trump cards, with the Matto' (*in vintidue carte de Trionfi, con el Matto*); the phrase could not have been better designed to leave us in uncertainty whether Viti regards the Matto as a trump or not. Clearly, the Matto is regarded as in some way different from the twenty-one ordinary *trionfi*: but whether that is because it plays a quite different role in the game, as it does when it serves as Excuse, or merely because, like the *Miseria* of the Sicilian pack, it does not bear a number, it is impossible to tell.

The only other early source giving any information about how Tarocco was played may be definitely associated with Ferrara. It is not, alas, an account of the rules, but a verse diatribe against the game by Flavio Alberto Lollio (1508-1568), entitled *Invettiva contra il Giuoco del Taroco* and first published in Venice in 1550.[7] Lollio was born in Florence, but lived most of his life in Ferrara, where he died, and he is referred to in the by-line of the poem as 'Flavio Alberto Lollio Ferrarese'. He assumes the game to be known to his readers, but describes a game in progress; this description is both illuminating and puzzling. The one thing that is absolutely clear is that three players take part in the game. The cards are dealt out in several rounds almost certainly five at a time; the poem follows the fortunes of a single player, referred to, save in an occasional line, in the second person singular. Evidently, after each round of the deal there was a pause, during which it was possible for a player to increase the value of the round, and also for one to propose going *a monte*, that is, abandoning the deal. This latter was, as we have seen, a very general custom in Italian games; but normally it required the agreement of all the players for the deal to be abandoned at any stage. The player whose fortunes are followed does not appear to be the dealer, for it is said at the outset only that the deal 'is begun', not that 'you begin' it. But his first five cards are good ones; the result is stated to be that 'you hold the invitation, and make it again' (*tu tien l'envito, & lo rifai*). The word I have here rendered 'invitation' is actually printed *enutto* in the first edition, a non-existent word. In the second edition of 1590 it appears as *invitto* ('unconquered'), which makes little sense; the most likely reading is *envito* or *invito* = 'invitation'. Presumably the invitation is to continue the deal for an increased value; our player not only accepts this invitation, but proposes a further increase. The player's next five cards are bad ones. Our player then goes *a monte* (*vai à monte*). This cannot mean, as it is rendered by Mr Kaplan in his partial and largely accurate translation, that he throws in his cards, because the deal continues, and we find him, after four rounds of dealing, with twenty cards; he is merely proposing an abandonment of the deal, but in vain, since another player is going to increase the stake, that is, the value of the round. There follow two more rounds of the deal, one good for our player, the other bad. He then expects some help from the last cards; but when they arrive, they are terrible, the opposite of what he needs. Presumably, then, he is dealt a final five cards; unfortunately, there is here an obscure line. When you are expecting the last cards to help you (*quando / L'ultime aspetti, che ti dian soccorso*), Lollio says, and now comes the obscure line: 'Having already invited them from the stock' (?); you then, he continues, see arrive hideous cards to make you die, etc. (*Tu ti vedi arrivare (oh dolor grande)/Carte galioffe da farti morire,/Totalmente contrarie al tuo bisogno*). The obscure line contains a questionable reading: in the 1550 edition it is printed *Havendogli invitata già dal resto*, which is ungrammatical. The grammar is corrected in the 1590 edition by the reading *Havendola invitata già dal resto* ('Having already invited it from the stock'), but there is nothing for the singular pronoun to refer to. Probably *Havendogli* was correct, the *gli*, in what would now be considered a grammatical error, referring back to the *ultime* [*carte*] (last cards), and *invitata* should be *invitate*. Assuming this to be so, we are left unclear in what sense the player has invited these last five cards (if there are five of them): perhaps by his invitation after the first round of the deal, perhaps by his acceptance of the increase in the stake after the second. Now, Lollio says, enraged by the miserable cards he has received at the end, the player hurls reproaches at 'the remainder of his cards, which are twenty'

---

[7] The *Invettiva* appears on pp. 272-82 of *Rime Piacevoli*, Venice, 1550, a collection of verses by various authors. A second edition was published in Ferrara in 1590. A selection from the poem as printed in the 1590 edition was included by Samuel Weller Singer as appendix XIII to his *Researches into the History of Playing Cards*, London, 1816, pp. 354-6. This selection includes most of the part describing the play, but, unfortunately, not quite all, in part because Singer evidently wished to spare the blushes of his readers by suppressing lines containing words like *orinale* and *cacapensieri*. He does not give a translation. A translation of part of the poem, without the original, is given by Stuart R. Kaplan, *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, pp. 29-30. The selection coincides very nearly, but not quite, with that made by Singer, but, unfortunately, no indication is given of the places where some lines have been omitted, and the omissions occasionally affect the sense; a reader with no other source to refer to would suppose that the whole of the poem had been translated.

(*Lo avanzo de le Carte, che son venti*); presumably these are the cards he received on the first four rounds of the deal, which is why I said that the dealer gave each player five cards at a time.

Our problems of interpretation are by no means over. The player now sorts his hand into the trumps (*trionfi*) and the four plain suits. Now comes the remark, '*quindi s'hai quattro,/O cinque Carte di Ronfa, tu temi/Che non ti muoia il Re, con le figure*': 'if you then have four or five *carte di ronfa*, you are afraid that your King and the court cards will die'. We know from accounts of Minchiate that a King 'dies' when it is captured by another player's trump; but what does Lollio mean by *carte di ronfa*? We saw in Chapter 7 that the term *ronfa* had a curious double meaning, sometimes referring to the play of a trump and sometimes to a long holding in a suit. This line of Lollio's is the only known instance of the use of the word in connection with a Tarot game. At this stage of his description, actual play has not yet started, and the reference to the King and the other court cards makes it evident that he is speaking of a holding in a plain suit. But that does not resolve all uncertainty. Why should our player be so anxious at having four or five cards in a suit, even if they are all high ones? If we are to understand that each player finishes with 25 cards (perhaps with the dealer taking the last three and discarding three – nothing is said about this), an average holding in a plain suit will be about 4·6. If there was no discard, it will be very unlikely that either of the other two will have a void in a suit in which one holds four or five cards; even if the dealer discards three cards, there is no especial danger that he will have created a void in that suit. Possibly four or five *carte di ronfa* are the top four or five cards of a suit in which the player has much greater length, say seven or eight altogether, though that seems a complex meaning for the simple phrase *carte di ronfa* to bear. Probably there was a penalty for losing a King; possibly there was a rule, as in Minchiate, obliging a player to surrender his King if a trump had been played to the first trick in that suit. But, with all these suppositions, the anxiety displayed – 'your heart aches and your mind is racked' – seems disproportionate to the actual danger.

It will be recalled that the French Tarot games described in the 1659 *Maison académique* were ones in which not all the cards were distributed among the players, and there is no mention of a discard. On the other hand, the Swiss three-handed game there described resembles later three-handed games played with the 78-card pack and without bidding in that the dealer gives 25 cards to each of the other two players and 28 to himself, discarding three. We saw that the Swiss manner of playing Tarot appears to have changed little between the seventeenth century and the twentieth; and two details of the modern game strongly suggest that the Swiss mode of play is based very directly upon Italian models. One is the option of abandoning the deal, by agreement, after each round of the deal, that is, in effect, of going *a monte*. The other is the signal, made by striking the table with the fist while leading trumps, given by a player to convey that he has the XXI. This signal, unknown except in Italy and Switzerland, is the *batto* of Sicilian tarocchi and of the old Bolognese game, and is related to the *busso* of the modern Bolognese game and also of Tressette, which is popular in Italian-speaking areas of Switzerland. The signal probably represents a feature of Italian Tarot play already present by the mid-seventeenth century. Both the Bolognese and Sicilian games bear witness to the same general principle, namely a complete distribution of the pack between the players save for two or three extra cards, going to the dealer except when there is some form of bidding. If it were not for the passage in Lollio's poem about the *carte di ronfa*, the most natural interpretation of the game he describes would be similar. The player receives twenty cards, and then, after that, some last ones, on which he has counted to redeem his hand; the obvious assumption is therefore that he receives 25 cards altogether, perhaps with the last three going to the dealer, who has to discard. This is reinforced by Lollio's later complaining about the tedious necessity of counting every trump that is played. When all the trumps have been distributed, or when, as in Minchiate, the players know just how many remain undealt, the counting of trumps is an utter necessity for successful play, above all for a player who wants to save or to capture the lowest trump. In a game in which a large number of cards remain undealt, it loses something of its importance.

Even with the mysterious passage about the *carte di ronfa*, this remains the most probable interpretation; but that passage does raise a doubt. The most likely meaning of 'four or five *carte di ronfa*' is the four or five top cards of a suit, irrespective of whether or not the player has other cards in that suit. If so, the alarm of Lollio's player at finding himself with such a holding remains exceedingly overwrought, if we suppose every player to have 25 cards. The Swiss game is, if our analysis is correct, in the Milanese tradition; Bologna had its own tradition, and the Sicilian game probably ultimately derives from Florence. But Lollio was surely describing Tarocco as played at Ferrara; and it is possible that the game played there differed from that played in, say, Milan in respect of the number of cards each player had when play began. How could such a supposition fit with what Lollio says? We have seen that it is unlikely that, in Lollio's game, there remained any undealt cards, and that, after the first four rounds of the deal, the player received some last cards; but we may ask why Lollio draws explicit attention to the number of cards – twenty – dealt out in the first four rounds of the deal, without mentioning, what is of greater importance, the number of cards the player held when the deal was completed. This question suggests the answer that 20 *was* the number of cards each player held before play began: that each player discarded as many cards as the 'last' ones he received, after the original twenty cards had been given out. Perhaps, on this last round of the deal, each player received six cards, discarding six; or perhaps the dealer received eight and the other players five each, making corresponding discards. True, Lollio says nothing at all about any discard; but, if we make such a supposition, we can at least make sense about the anxiety a player might feel if he had all four court cards in some suit, for then he would be in serious danger of losing them.

I offer this suggestion only as a possibility; I do not consider it the most likely one, though I shall explore possible consequences of it below. For the present, let us return to Lollio's account. Actual play now begins: our unfortunate player finds himself having to keep following suit to the leads of the other two players, evidently unable to win a trick. It is, of course, perfectly evident from the mention of following suit, as from the earlier reference to the King's dying, that we have here a trick-taking game, in which the *trionfi* serve as trumps. When our player revokes, the voices of the others are raised in protest; otherwise, one must keep even more silent than when attending Mass. Ferrarese players plainly took the game very seriously. From the remark, in the *carte di ronfa* passage, about the King dying, with the court cards, it is apparent that all the court cards were counting cards, and possible that, as in Minchiate, one scored not only for having them among one's tricks, but additionally for capturing them. But Lollio remarks grumblingly that it is necessary to take note of every least card that is played. This suggests that, as in the Bolognese game, players may have scored not only for individual cards won in tricks, but also for particular combinations of cards among those so won; otherwise, it would be a grave exaggeration to say that a player had to take note of every single card. If it should sometimes happen that you have a good hand, Lollio says, you play it so badly that you lose one or two dozen of them, sometimes all (*ne perdi/Una dozzina ò due: tal hora tutti*). If Lollio here means that you lose one or two dozen of your cards, this would rule out an interpretation under which the players received less than 25 cards each; but it seems more likely that *dozzine* are here some type of scoring device or token. And now comes a remark that is really baffling. How many times, Lollio asks, are you unable to cover the Matto? (*Quante volte non puoi coprire il Matto*?) As a result, you unwillingly find yourself robbed of the good you have gained (*Onde mal grado tuo, spogliar ti senti/Del buon c'havevi*). What is it to 'cover' the Matto, and why does it have such disastrous consequences? One might conjecture that 'covering' the Matto consisted in giving a card in exchange for it, the player unable to do so having to surrender the Matto. But this can hardly be made to fit the context: a player in such a position is one who has won no tricks, and such a player has no other good to be robbed of. The most natural interpretation of the word 'cover' is 'to play a higher card', i.e. to capture. If this is right, then, in the Ferrarese game, the Matto cannot have served as Excuse, as in the Bolognese and Sicilian games and in Minchiate, but must have been a trump, presumably the lowest one, as in Sedici or Trentuno. Lollio does not mention the Bagatto or *Bagatella*, save in a general list of *trionfi* after the description of play; the Matto is here mentioned in just the context where we should expect the Bagatto to be spoken of. The Matto must surely have been a counting card; but that by itself does not explain why a failure to capture it (or, possibly, a failure to bring it home) should have spelled such ruin. Perhaps there was a high premium for bringing it home, or a high penalty for failing to do so; or perhaps, if our earlier supposition that a player scored for particular combinations of cards won in tricks is correct, the Matto could, as in Minchiate, be added to such combinations, or functioned as a wild card, like the two *contatori* in the Bolognese game, when such combinations were being scored.

At this point, Lollio leaves his description of the play to engage in a general diatribe against the game and the childish nature of the cards used. From his poem, I have extracted more problems than solutions; but the poem is precious for anyone interested in the history of the game of Tarot, since it is the only account of the game, of any kind, from before the seventeenth century. I therefore give in the appendix the whole text of the relevant passage, with the best attempt at a translation I have been able to make, in the hope that someone will be able to arrive at a surer interpretation than I have been able to do.

Now, with very few exceptions, it is characteristic of later Tarot games, of the most diverse kinds and whatever the size of the pack, that there is no stock of undealt cards, but that every card in the pack counts, at the end of the round, to one or another player or side. It is almost equally characteristic that there is a small residue of undealt cards forming a talon, which, in games without bidding, goes to the dealer, and whose distribution, in games with bidding, depends upon the final bid; in each case, those receiving additional cards must discard an equal number, under certain nearly constant constraints. This practice is not a mere device for handling the situation when the number of cards in the pack is not exactly divisible by the number of players, since it is observed in three-handed games, even without bidding, played with the 78-card pack; the most striking example is that of Tarok-Quadrille, played by four players with only 76 cards, in which the dealer still takes four extra cards. Even Minchiate is not a genuine exception to this rule, because, although the mechanics are different, there are still discards, and the principle is upheld that the players should know how many cards of each suit are in play, even though not every card belongs at the end of the round to one side or the other. Both the Bolognese and Sicilian games incorporate the standard practice. It therefore seems overwhelmingly probable that the practice is one going back to an early stage in the history of the Tarot games: the fact that it is found in both Bolognese and Sicilian Tarocchi debars us from supposing that it was invented outside Italy and introduced there only at the time of the invasion of the Tarot de Marseille pattern in the eighteenth century. This conclusion is reinforced by an etymological consideration. In the terminology used in Germany, the discard was almost always referred to as the *Scat*, and this name was also used, by transference, for the talon; the exception is the game of Cego, in which the talon is called the *Blinde* and the discard the *Legage*. In Austria, too, the term *Scat*, sometimes in the form *Scar*, was originally used, although it was later dropped in favour of the French word *Talon* for the talon, with no separate noun being used for the discard. The words *Scat* and *Scar* are obviously corruptions of the Italian word *scarto*, meaning 'discard', and it therefore seems likely that the practice itself is of Italian origin. It might be objected that the borrowing of the term *Scat* may have occurred only after the reintroduction of the 78-card game from France into Italy in the eighteenth century; we know that Viennese Tarot players of the mid-eighteenth century borrowed a specific form of play from Lombardy, and, with it, an Italianate vocabulary, and that this Viennese/Lombard game spread into Germany and as far as the Netherlands. But this objection appears unsound: classic Tarot games, in which the word *Scat* was used, were being played in Germany before the spread of the Viennese/Lombard game.

A possible source for the practice may have been a card game called Scartino, of which we hear much from a brief period around 1500: there are over a dozen references to it between 1492 and 1517.[8] We have no idea how Scartino was played, although it appears to have demanded a special type of pack; for instance, Lodovico il Moro wrote in 1496 to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este complaining that the latter had not sent him the *carte de scartino* that he had promised, and there are other references to orders for packs of Scartino cards. The game seems to have originated from Ferrara: it was a favourite game both of Beatrice d'Este, wife of Lodovico il Moro, Duke of Milan, and of Isabella d'Este, wife of Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua. The name *Scartino* is presumably connected with the verb *scartare*, 'to discard', and games are often named after their most characteristic or novel feature. It is therefore a possibility that this was a trick-taking game in which a new practice was introduced, namely that the dealer took some extra cards and discarded a corresponding number. If so, it could be that it was from Scartino that this practice was taken over into Tarocco games, in which it had been previously unknown, and that Scartino, after its short-lived popularity, died out, having made a lasting contribution to card play. This, of course, is the merest guess: Scartino may not have been a trick-taking game at all, but, say, one in which the winner was the player who first contrived to get rid of all his cards after the fashion of a Stops game.

---

[8] For references to Scartino, as played by Beatrice, Isabella, Ercole, Ippolito and Alfonso d'Este, Lodovico il Moro, and others, see: F. Malaguzzi-Valeri, *La corte di Lodovico il Moro*, vol. 1, Milan, 1913, p. 575; A. Venturi, 'Relazioni artistiche tra le corti di Milano e Ferrara nel secolo XV', *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, anno XII (pp. 225-80), 1885, p. 254; A. Luzio and R. Renier, *Mantova e Urbino*, Turin and Rome, 1893, pp. 63-5, especially fn. 3, p. 63; the same two authors, 'Delle relazioni di Isabella d'Este Gonzaga con Lodovico e Beatrice Sforza', *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, anno XVII (pp. 74-119, 346-99, 619-74), 1890, p. 368, fn. 1, and pp. 379-80; A. Luzio, *I precettori d'Isabella d'Este*, Ancona, 1887, p. 22; G. Bertoni, 'Tarocchi versificati' in *Poesie, leggende, costumanze del medio evo*, Modena,

If Scartino did influence Tarocco, it is possible that the practice whereby the dealer took extra cards and made a corresponding discard was not an original feature of Tarot games, but was incorporated into them about the beginning of the sixteenth century, in time for it to be imported, as a feature of the game, when Tarot arrived in Switzerland. In that case, the French games described in the *Maison académique* may represent a yet more ancient tradition; if our conjecture that they were derived from Piedmont is correct, Tarot playing in that region may go back to the very earliest times, the players remaining exceptionally conservative. But the hypothesis that the important feature of the discard was borrowed from Scartino should be treated with great caution, since it implies a continued mutual influence between the style of Tarocco play in all four great early centres, Ferrara, Milan, Bologna and Florence. However this may be, we have every reason to assume that the principal games played with the Tarot pack were from the start trick-taking games in which the *trionfi* were permanent trumps, and in which it was obligatory to follow suit when possible and, when one could not, to play a trump if possible: the only doubt is as to the original use of the Matto. There is also every reason to assume that they were from the start *complex* ones in our technical sense, i.e. with different cards carrying differing point-values. There is scarcely any indication of a Tarot game in which only the number of tricks taken is significant. What we have throughout called the 'original' method of reckoning points, namely by counting 1 point for each trick, with the point-values of counting cards reckoned separately, as in the Spanish game of Malilla, must indeed have been the original one: on no other assumption can we explain the genesis of the distinctive method of computing the point-totals found in almost all Tarot games. In every Tarot game except Minchiate, the counting cards of the plain suits are the court cards, as Lollio's poem suggests; and, as in many games with the regular pack, they always have point values increasing by 1 with each card. So constant is this feature that we can take it as certain that it was original, their values under the original system being 4 for the King, 3 for the Queen, 2 for the Cavallo and 1 for the Jack.

Everywhere outside Italy, the three remaining counting cards are the XXI, the Bagatto and the Fool or Matto. Since the French and the Swiss probably imported the game of Tarot from Milan, and the Germans imported it from France, the selection of these three counting cards, in addition to the court cards, is likely to be the Milanese practice. In Bologna, as we have seen, the four counting cards other than the court cards were the top two trumps, the

---

1917, p. 219; and the *Diario Ferrarese* of 1499 in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 376. A letter of August 1493 quoted by Malaguzzi-Valeri and by Luzio and Renier appears to imply that Scartino was a three-handed game. The earliest reference is from 1492; one is from 1509, one from 1517, and all the rest from the 1490s. Several concern the obtaining or ordering of packs of Scartino cards (*para de carte da scartino* or *para de scartini*), which appear all to have come from Ferrara; what was special about these cards there is no way of telling. It is just conceivable that Scartino was itself a particular type of Tarot game, and that these were therefore Tarot packs of a special type; but, unless they were very special, it does not seem very likely that Lodovico Sforza should have been having to obtain Tarot packs from elsewhere. Most of the references are about games of Scartino being played.

Bagatto and the Matto; and we should take the evidence of the Bolognese game particularly seriously, since the indications are that Bolognese players have always observed an extreme conservatism in their manner of play, which, in essentials, probably therefore faithfully represents a sixteenth-century style of game. Nevertheless, as already noted, although both Minchiate and Sicilian Tarocchi admit several other counting cards, both games retain features which set the top trump, the Bagatto and the Matto aside from the other cards. It therefore seems likely that the system found in all non-Italian Tarot games, whereby these three cards equal the Kings in value, and all the other trumps are low cards, was the original one. We still have to account for the fact that, in all the Italian Tarot games surviving from before the eighteenth century, this system has been replaced by one under which at least one other trump has a point-value.

It may be that no further explanation is required than that this was a means adopted to make the game more complicated and more interesting. One fact, however, suggests the possibility of a more specific explanation. This is the coincidence that, when the standard manner of counting points is being used, the cards being counted in threes, the total number of points, when the full pack is employed, is the same as the number of cards in the pack, namely 78; and this is the same as to say that, when the original method of counting points was used, the total came to 78 when the game was a three-handed one. Perhaps this is merely accidental. But there is a further coincidence: when there are no bonuses, the total number of points in Trappola is also 78; it is hard to avoid thinking that this was arranged to agree with the point-total in Tarocco games.

The aggregate number of points gained by all the players together is not constant, and is therefore not significant, except in games in which all the counting cards are in play, or at least contribute to some player's point-total. If our supposition that this was not true of the earliest Tarocco games is correct, the agreement between the number of cards in the pack and the total number of points in a three-handed game cannot have existed until the new style of play, in which the entire pack was distributed, came into vogue; it is therefore likely to have been accidental in the first instance. But, once noticed, it is likely to have seemed a desirable and amusing feature: the coincidence of the 78 points and 78 cards strikes me as just the sort of conceit that would appeal to men and women of Renaissance times.

If so, some method would probably have been devised for extending it to games played with more than three players. One possibility is that this was the genesis of the score for the last trick. It is only because there is such a score in Trappola that the total number of points comes to 78; without it, it would amount only to 72. In assuming that the total number of points was 78 in early, as in later, three-handed Tarocco games, we have in effect been assuming that in those games there was no score for the last trick. But, when the game is played by four players, each must start with 19 cards, the dealer having had an extra two and having discarded two; at least, this is how it must be if we assume that, as in the later games, only the dealer received extra cards, and that he received as few as possible. On the original method of reckoning points, 1 point is allowed for each trick of four cards. In supposing the total number of points in the three-handed game to be 78, we were tacitly assuming that 1 point was awarded to the dealer for his discard of three cards; so let us assume that, in the four-handed game, the dealer was awarded 1 point for his two discarded cards. With no further adjustment, the total number of points in the four-handed game will then be only 72: namely 52 for the nineteen counting cards, 19 for the nineteen tricks and 1 for the dealer's discard. This could be brought up to 78 once more by awarding 6 points for the last trick – its value both in Trappola and in the Bolognese form of Tarocco. We may, admittedly, be on quite the wrong track: but it is conceivable that this was the original motivation for the score for the last trick. Five-handed Tarot games are rare; but, if the painting of 'The Tarocchi Players' at the Casa Borromeo in Milan deserves its name, they are as old as the Tarot pack itself. Five players can receive at most 15 cards each, with a discard of three cards for the dealer, making a total of 68 points on the cards themselves: this would then require a score of 10 points for the last trick – its value in Minchiate – to bring it up to 78.

The fact that a score for the last trick is virtually unknown outside Italy makes it probable that it was not awarded in the early Milanese game, or at least not in the three-handed form of it. It may nevertheless be thought to be more likely that, in other areas of Italy, it was an original feature of the game, independent of the number of players. Without altering our other assumptions, we cannot reconcile this supposition with an aggregate total of 78 points in the three-handed game. It will be recalled, however, that our inconclusive study of Lollio's poem yielded a possible alternative interpretation of the deal, one according to which each player had an opportunity to discard and ended with a hand of 20 cards. If points were awarded, as usual, for counting cards, whether in tricks or in the discards, but otherwise only for actual tricks taken, the aggregate total would be 72 points (52 for counting cards + 20 for tricks); with a score of 6 points for the last trick, this would yield a total of 78.

As already remarked, the interpretation of Lollio's account here invoked is not the more probable one, though it does help to resolve the problem about the *carte di ronfa*. But suppose that it were correct: how, then, could the aggregate of 78 points be maintained in a four-handed form? We already know one answer to this – 19 cards to each player, a discard of two cards for the dealer, counting 1 point, and 6 points for the last trick. Such a game would, however, lack sufficient analogy to the three-handed form we are hypothesising. If each player were to be able to make a discard, no points being awarded for the discards save for the counting cards contained in them, the aggregate total could be maintained only by assigning a point-value to another trump. The most likely assignment of this kind would be one of 4 points to the second highest trump; the aggregate total of 78 points would then be ensured if each player held 16 cards at the start of play (56 points for counting cards, 16 for tricks and an extra 6 for the last trick). In such a game, the remaining 14 cards would be distributed among the four players, with corresponding discards (say five to the dealer and three to each of the other three players). Such a game, played with the full pack and without *cricche* or sequences, might be the remote ancestor of the Bolognese game. After the *cricche* and sequences had been introduced, the aggregate total would again become variable and hence unimportant; there would then have been no obstacle to the subsequent shortening of the pack. In a five-handed game devised according to the same principles, yet one more trump would have to acquire a point-value: the players would then have to begin play with hands of 12 cards each, with a total discard of 18 (say five by the dealer and three by each of the others).

It would be wrong to give much weight to either of these alternative speculations. Whether the variations in the set of counting cards came about in this way or in some other, the Sicilian game, presumably going back to the seventeenth century, in which, in addition to the Bagatto, the Matto and the court cards, all five top trumps are recognised as counting cards, testifies to a freedom felt in Italy about the selection of the counting cards never exercised in other countries. The *arie* of the Sicilian game may have been imitated from those of Minchiate; more probably, those of Minchiate were borrowed from some earlier Florentine game, played with the 78-card pack and directly ancestral to Sicilian Tarocchi. The fact that, nevertheless, the three cards which, in games played outside Italy, are always the only ones beside the court cards to possess point-values seem in Italy also to have been regarded as in some manner special may be due to their having been the only original counting cards, or to their being the only ones recognised in Milan, or possibly to the three-handed game's having acquired, save in Bologna, an ascendancy over other forms. This effect would have been reinforced if there were, in some three-handed games, a practice of making declarations of combinations of cards held in hand before the beginning of play, and among such combinations were the set of the three counting cards of the *tarocchi* (the *tous les trois* of other lands). Such declarations are not mentioned in Lollio's poem, but, in view of the importance that they assumed both in Tarocchino and in Minchiate, as well as their presence in non-Italian Tarot games, it is extremely likely that they figured in some pre-eighteenth-century Italian games played with the 78-card pack. If a declaration of the set consisting of the highest trump, the Bagatto and the Matto were carried over into games with more than three players, despite there being one or more other trumps with point-values, this would be enough to preserve a sense that these three cards were especially important and in some way belonged together.

It is in any case likely that it was in its three-handed form that the game of Tarot first travelled from Italy to France and Switzerland,

and from there to other countries; and, as far as the records show, it was as a three-handed game that it first appeared both in Switzerland and Germany. But it did not take with it any score for the last trick; and this makes it likely that such a score was absent from the game as played in Milan. We can associate it firmly with the games played with the trumps arranged in a type A order, those of Bologna, Florence, Rome and, eventually, Sicily. But, in view of its presence in Trappola, it is very likely to have figured in the Tarot games played in Venice and Ferrara, observing a type B order for the trumps.

There is one striking similarity between Tarocchino and Minchiate. In both of them, the special combinations of cards for which points are earned, the *cricche* and sequences of Tarocchino and the *versicole* of Minchiate, play the predominant role, primarily because they are scored for when they are contained within the tricks won by a pair of partners, and in consequence overwhelm the points made on individual cards, particularly in Tarocchino. We have noted that there is some oblique indication in Lollio's poem that the game he was describing had the same feature, although we cannot be at all sure of this. It is a feature that does not appear in the Sicilian game. It evidently represents one line along which Tarot games developed in Italy during the sixteenth century; but either that was not the only line of development, or it had, by the seventeenth century, been generally abandoned.

But for the single line in Lollio's poem, 'How many times are you unable to cover the Matto?', the only reasonable assumption would be that the Matto served from the beginning as Excuse; the Piedmontese games of Sedici and Trentuno would then have to be regarded as freaks, with no historical importance. It seems hard to interpret Lollio's question, however, save on the supposition that, for him, the Matto was a low trump which it was of the highest importance to capture; and since, as observed, the poem is the sole direct piece of evidence that we have concerning the way in which Tarot was played in the sixteenth century, we must take it seriously. If, as I have argued, the invention of the Tarot pack represented, if not the first, at any rate an independent invention of the idea of trumps, then it would be a little surprising if, from the first, the Matto had, in play, its special role of Excuse: for that presupposes the simultaneous introduction of two radically new ideas into trick-taking play, whereas, in games, as in other fields, it is rare for anyone to have more than one entirely new idea at a time. The possibility thus arises that originally the Matto was the lowest trump and the Bagatto only the second lowest; if, as seems likely, those two cards were both counting cards from the start, then, at least in the three-handed game, the counting cards in trumps consisted originally of the highest one and the two lowest. We have seen that Lollio's remarks about the consequences of failing to 'cover' the Matto suggest that it was not merely one among several counting cards with a high point-value; and I suggested that perhaps it functioned like a *contatore* in Tarocchino, that is, as a wild card able to fill gaps in special scoring combinations of cards won in tricks. If so, it would have been seen as a card having a function different from all others, even though it behaved in actual play simply as the lowest trump; and this might serve to explain why it was never numbered or regarded as occupying a numerical position. On this hypothesis, the invention of its special role in play, as Excuse, must have occurred at some stage after the original invention of the game. If this is correct, this was only the first of two changes of role to which the Fool was subjected in the history of Tarot; as we shall see in Part IV, it later became a trump once more, this time the highest trump, beating even the XXI.

Thus the position of the Bagatto in Sicilian Tarocchi, as bearing the number 1 and as yet not being the lowest of the trump cards, may not have been wholly unparalleled. It was suggested in the last chapter that the practice, in packs in which the trumps are arranged in an order of type A, of starting the numbering after the Bagatto may have been a device for ensuring that Death received the number 13. If, however, the Matto was originally the lowest trump, the numbering nevertheless always starting after it, an alternative interpretation becomes possible. If the original order was of type B or type C, then type A orders may have been a later development, which took place only after the Matto had acquired its new role of Excuse; the practice of starting the numbering after the Bagatto may then have been an imitation of the previous practice of starting it after the Matto when that card was the lowest trump. On this interpretation, our previous idea should be inverted: it would in this case have been the displacement of the numbering one place upwards that prompted the rearrangement of the ordering, all three Virtues having to be brought below Death in order to ensure to that card the number 13.

I do not pretend to be advancing a satisfactory theory on this question. On the contrary, it is definitely a puzzle; and perhaps we lack the means of solving it. If we knew only of the games with the 54-card pack, to be described in Part IV, in which the Fool plays an entirely different role, and had no more than its name, *der Sküs*, and one cryptic line from a poem to hint to us of its former role as Excuse, it is improbable that we should ever guess how it had been used in other games; or, conversely, if we knew nothing of the games with the 54-card pack save the allusions in some poem like Lollio's, we should never deduce the function of the *Sküs* in those games. The only piece of evidence we have for the Matto's having served as the lowest trump are the passage in Lollio's poem and the games of Sedici and Trentuno, which look like a survival from an earlier epoch, but in which the Matto does not have a high point-value; to these we may add, as a very tenuous clue, Pier Antonio Viti's failure to specify the role of the Matto in the game with Boiardo's pack, although he specifies almost all other particulars. Everything else that we know would fit more easily with the supposition that the Matto served as Excuse from the first invention of the game of Tarot. Even Sedīci and Trentuno fail to fit perfectly with our hypothesis, because, when it is assumed, it is most natural to think of the type A orders as coming into existence after the introduction of the new way of using the Matto, as Excuse, whereas the fact that in Piedmont the *Angelo* was treated as higher than the *Mondo* suggests that it was a type A order that had been familiar there before the game died out. If the present hypothesis is to be entertained at all, the invention of the new role for the Matto cannot be dated later than the 1470s. The reason for this is that, whereas in Garzoni's book, in Susio's poem and in the Bertoni poem, the trumps are listed in sequence, beginning with the highest, *il Mondo* (the World), with the Matto coming at the end, the arrangement in the Steele sermon, written at least seventy years before Lollio's poem, is different. In the sermon the trumps are listed in ascending order, beginning with *el bagatella*, and the Matto, cited as *el matto sie nulla* (the Fool or zero), still comes at the end, after the 21, which is oddly cited as '21. *El mondo cioe dio padre*' ('21. The World, that is, God the Father'). Moreover, the entry for the *Bagatella* reads in full '*Primus dicitur el bagatella: et est omnium inferior*' ('The first is called the *bagatella*; and it is the lowest of all');[9] this explicit statement is immediately preceded by a sentence stating that there are twenty-one trumps (*Sunt enim 21 triumphi* ...). All this is quite conclusive evidence that the preacher did not regard the Matto as a trump in the proper sense, and did not take it as ranking below the Bagatto. Now Lollio was writing some seventy or eighty years later. Admittedly, it may have been some time since he had played Tarocco, since, earlier in the poem, he describes himself as having formerly been an enthusiast for it, and as only later having come to detest it. But he was not an old man when he wrote the *Invettiva*; he was only 42 when it was published. This may indicate, therefore, that his line about the Matto should be understood in some quite different way from that adopted here. If not, it must be that the Ferrarese game was in this respect of a more ancient type than that known to the preacher of the Steele sermon. This is not impossible. Games in which the Fool played its new role as the highest trump and ones in which it served, in traditional fashion, as Excuse, coexisted in Germany for a considerable period, and both are played, in different countries, to this day. But, as remarked, the whole question is a puzzle; and I regret having to leave it unresolved.

If there is a problem about the Matto, there is a surprise concerning the Bagatto, or, more exactly, concerning the bonus for the Bagatto ultimo, for winning the last trick with the Bagatto. Throughout the Austrian Empire, this Pagat ultimo bonus was to become the most celebrated feature of Tarock in all its forms. The use of the Italian term *ultimo* naturally suggests that the practice was of Italian origin; and an equally natural conjecture is that it was an adaptation of the Trappola idea of a bonus for winning the last trick with the lowest card of a suit. Trappola as described by Cardano was a game without trumps; but it may well be that it had incorporated the idea of trumps before it migrated from Venice to more northerly regions. These speculations, natural as they are, do not square with the facts. There is no indication of a bonus for the Bagatto ultimo in Bolognese or Sicilian Tarocchi or in Minchiate, nor any hint of it in Lollio's poem or in any of the Italian literary sources which refer to the individual Tarot trumps. As for the term *ultimo*, this was used in nineteenth-century Vienna, but there is no evidence for its use anywhere outside Italy before the nineteenth century; the bonus itself was a feature of German Tarok games played in the eighteenth century, before the term *ultimo* had been adopted. The bonus does not seem to have been imitated from Trappola, but, as we saw in Chapter 11, to have originated as a correlative to a penalty for losing the Pagat, doubled when this happened in the last trick; and it was probably in Germany that it made its first appearance.

---

[9] The words are here given in full, as in Steele's article, rather than in the severely abbreviated form in which they appear in the manuscript.

We saw that the Bagatto ultimo bonus was well established in Piedmont by 1787, presumably having reached Italy from Germany via France. It may well be that it arrived in Austria, not directly from Germany, but by the route Germany-France-Italy-Austria, bringing the term *ultimo* with it from Italy. Milan was awarded to Austria under the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. The award was contested by the Spanish Bourbons, in alliance with the French, but, under Maria Theresa, Milan came firmly under Austrian control at the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, and remained so until 1859, save for the Napoleonic interlude from 1796 to 1814. The bonus for winning the last trick with the Bagatto or Pagat presumably reached Vienna from Italy at some time during the later eighteenth century, the Italian term *ultimo* being adopted for a practice not in origin Italian.

As we shall see in the next chapter, what may have been copied from Trappola games was the practice of announcing at the start of play an intention to gain the bonus for Pagat ultimo. But this development did not take place until the early nineteenth century, and then not in Italy, where Trappola had long been forgotten, but, almost certainly, in Austria, as an imitation of the announcement of intention to make a twenty-six in Hundertspiel; we find it in Austria by 1821, and in Piedmont by 1830. However the Bagatto ultimo bonus and announcement originated, we find no trace of the former before the eighteenth century or of the latter before the nineteenth: in both cases the evidence is clearly against an Italian origin.

We succeeded, in the last chapter, in reconstructing, from a meagre supply of clues, the history of the Tarot pack in Italy from the fifteenth century to the eighteenth. Unfortunately, no comparable success can be claimed for the attempt in this chapter to reconstruct the early history of the game in Italy. There are as many clues in this case as in the other; but some are hard to interpret, and some point in opposite directions. I hope that someone, reflecting on the evidence, will be better able to discern a pattern than I have succeeded in doing; or perhaps new evidence will come to light.

Appendix

The following is the text of that part of the poem from the last line of p. 276 to the last line of p. 279 in the 1550 edition; I believe that this includes all that bears in any degree on the way the game was played. The footnotes give readings from the 1590 edition, as quoted by Singer, that represent significant emendations, together with three other emendations in square brackets.

Ecco che s'incomincia a dar le carte:
La prima man ti fà vna bella vista,
Tal, che tu tien l'enutto,[1] & lo rifai:
Quelle, che vengon dietro, altra facenda
Mostrano hauer: ne più de' casi tuoi
Tengon memoria alcuna: onde tu stai
Sospeso al quanto: & di vada: quell'altro
Ilqual par che il fauor lor si prometta,
Ingrossera[2] la posta: allhor trafitto
Da vergogna, dolor, d'inuidia, e d'ire,
Ten vai à monte, co'l viso abbassato.
Non à si gran cordoglio vn Capitano,
Quando si crede hauer la pugna vinta,
E mentre ei grida vittoria, vittoria;
Da nuouo assalto sopragiunto vede
Andar la gente sua rotta, o dispersa,
Quando hà costui. Vengon dapoi quell'altre
Due man di carte, hor liete hor triste: & quando
L'vltime aspetti, che ti dian soccorso
Hauendogli[3] inuitata già dal resto,
Tu ti uedi arriuare (oh dolor grande)
Carte galioffe[4] da farti morire,
Totalmente contrarie al tuo bisogno.
Onde di stizza auampi; e tutto pieno
Di mal tal talento,[5] rimbrottando pigli
Lo auanzo de le Carte, che son uenti.

[1] l'invitto
[2] [ingrosserà]
[3] Havendola
[4] gaglioffe
[5] mal talento

Queste t'empien[6] le mani, & buona pezza
Ti dan trauaglio e briga, in rassettare.
Dinar; Coppe; Baston, Spade; e Trionfi.
Però che ti conuien ad una, ad una,
Metterle in ordinanza; & far di loro,
Come ſarebbe il buon pastor, che hauesse
Di molti armenti; apparecchiando mandre
Diuerse per ciascun Quindi s'hai quattro
O cinque Carte di Ronfa, tu temi
Che non ti muoia il Re, con le figure:
Onde si strugge il cuor, spesma, la mente,[7]
Stando in bilancia fra speme, e timore.
Quello è lo isfinimento e'l creppacuore,
Che sei sforzato à tener per tuo specchio
Certe cartaccie che ti fan languire:
Et, come se tu fussi un'Orinale,
Seruir conuienti à gli altri due compagni,
Rispondendo, à ciascun giuoco, per giuoco:
Et se per ignoranza, ò per errore,
Da in una Carta,[8] che non uada à uerso,
Tu senti andar le uoci infino al cielo.
Ne ti pensar che quiui sian finite
Le pene tue: bisogna tener conto
D'ogni minima Carta, che si giuochi,
Altramente ogni cosa va in ruina.
Però tu brami spesso la memoria
Di Mitridate, di Cesare, ò di Ciro.
Et s'egli auien tal hor c'habbi un bel giuoco,
T'andrà si mal giocato, che ne perdi
Vna dozzina ò due: tal hora tutti.
Quante volte non puoi coprire il Matto?
Onde mal grado tuo, spogliar ti senti
Del buon c'haueui: & sembri la cornacchia,
Che restò spennacchiata infra gli vccelli,
Allhora se tu fossi uno Aristide,
Vn Socrate, un Zenone, un Giobbe, un ſasso,
Tu sprezzaresti il fren della patienza,
Stracciaresti i Tarocchi in mille pezzi,
Maladicendo il primo che ti pose
Mai carte in mano, e t'insegnò à giocare.
Doue lasso quel numerar noioso
D'ogni Trionfo, ch'esca fuori? o quanto
Fastidio hai tu di questo, che non puoi
Pur ragionar, pur dire una parola:
Anzi seruar conuien maggior silentio
Che non si fà alla Predica, o la Messa.
Ei mostrò ben d'hauer poca facenda,
Et esser certo vn bel cacapensieri
Colui, che fu inuentor di simil baia:
Creder si dè, ch'ei fussi di pintore
Ignobil, scioperate,[9] e senza soldi,
Che per buscarsi il pan si, mise[10] a fare
Cotali filostroccole da putti.
Che vuol dir altro il Bagatella, e'l Matto,
Se non ch'ei fusse vn ciurmatore, e vn barro?
Che significar altro la Papessa,
Il Carro, il Traditor, la Ruota, il Gobbo;
La Fortezza, la Stella, il Sol, la Luna,
E la Morte, e l'Inferno; e tutto il resto
Di questa bizaria girando l'esca,
Se non che questi hauea il capo suentato,
Pien di fumo, Pancucchi, e Fanfalucche?
Et che sia ver, colei che versa i fiaschi,
Ci mostra chiar ch'ei fusse vn ebbriaco;
E quel nome fantastico, e bizarro
Di Tarocco, senz'ethimologia,
Fa palese à ciascun, che i ghiribizzi
Gli hauesser guasto, e zorpiato il ceruello.

Dr Lorenzo Minio-Paluello very kindly went through this passage with me; on the basis of his help, and I hope without importing any errors of my own, I append the following translation.

See, the cards are beginning to be dealt. The first hand looks good to you, so that you hold the invitation [reading *l'invito* in view of the *invitata* that comes later], and make it again. Those [cards] that come next show a different state of affairs; they no longer have your chances in mind. You therefore remain in suspense; and on it goes[?]. That other [player] who seems to expect their favour [the favour of the cards] will increase the stake; then, wounded by shame, pain, envy and anger, you go *a monte*, with face downcast.

A Captain who thinks he has won the battle, and, while he cries, 'Victory, victory!', sees his people crushed or dispersed by an unexpected new attack, does not feel anguish so great as does this [player].

There then come two other hands of cards, first fortunate, then miserable: and when you are expecting the last [cards] to give you some help, having invited them [reading *Havendogli invitate*] from the stock [?], you see arrive (oh, bitter pain) hideous cards to make you die, quite the contrary of what you need. You are therefore inflamed with vexation, and, full of an evil disposition, you begin scolding the remainder of your cards, which are twenty.

These fill your hands, and for a long time they give you trouble and worry to arrange Coins, Cups, Batons, Swords and Trumps, because it is useful to put them in order one by one; to do with them as a good shepherd would do, if he had many flocks, preparing different folds for each. Then, if you have four or five *carte di ronfa*, you fear that the King will die, with the court cards; and therefore your heart aches and your mind is racked, standing in balance between hope and fear.

That is the exhaustion and the heartbreak, when you are forced to keep before your eyes, as in a mirror, some low cards that make you droop. And, as if you were a urinal, you must be at the disposal of the two other players, having to respond suit by suit to each; and if, by ignorance or mistake, you play a card which does not fit, you hear their voices go up to the skies.

---

[6] t'empion
[7] spasma la mente
[8] Dai una carta
[9] [scioperato]
[10] [pan, si mise]

Do not think that your sufferings are at an end here. You must take account of every least card that is played, otherwise everything goes to ruin. You therefore often long for the memory of Mithridates, of Caesar or of Cyrus.

And if it sometimes happens that you have a good hand, you will play it so badly that you lose one or two dozens; sometimes you lose them all.

How many times are you unable to cover the Matto? Whence you feel that, against your will, you are deprived of the good you have; and you look like the crow that lost its feathers, among the other birds. Therefore, if you were an Aristides, a Socrates, a Zeno, a Job, a stone, you would despise the curb of patience, and would tear the *tarocchi* in a thousand pieces, cursing the first person who ever put the cards in your hands and taught you to play.

Where do I leave that tedious counting of each trump that comes out? How much annoyance you have from being unable to discuss anything or say even a single word: one must keep greater silence than one does at a sermon or at Mass.

He who invented such nonsense showed himself to have little to do, and truly to have diarrhoea of the mind; we must suppose that he was a worthless painter, out of work and penniless, who, in order to earn his bread, started making such childish gibberish.

What else do the Bagatella and the Matto mean, save that he was a trickster and a cheat? What else can they signify, the Popess, the Chariot, the Traitor, the Wheel, the Hunchback, Fortitude, the Star, the Sun, the Moon, Death, Hell and all the rest of this revolving *bizarrerie*, save that he [the inventor] had an empty head, full of smoke, caprices and idle tales? The woman who empties wine-bottles [Temperance] clearly shows that it is also true that he was a drunkard. And that whimsical and bizarre name 'Tarocco', lacking an etymology, makes it manifest to everyone that his fantasies had damaged and ruined his brain.